THE BRITISH JOURNAL
OF
DELINQUENCY

Vol. I April, 1951 No. 4

EDITORIAL

A Journal dedicated to a new or relatively new subject cannot expect to give a pattern to future methods of enquiry; it can at most suggest, from the variety of its articles, the rich field it covers and from which it can gather a harvest to nourish its future growth. Looking back upon a year's work we can at least say that we have aroused interest, as our growing number of subscribers shows. Furthermore, the variety of topics covered shows how many disciplines are involved.

We cannot rest satisfied with what we have already done. For consider the many basic subjects which still remain to be explored, the prejudices to be undermined, the medico-legal wrangles which await rational settlement. In the penological field, for example, not only do centuries of usage, but the long history of man's deep prejudice in favour of punishment also call for psychopathological inspection.

Some of our space has already been given over to statistical studies, which in themselves answer some questions, but set new ones. We shall need more clinical studies showing the relationship of nurture to distorted social attitudes, and the effects of child psychology in determining antisocial behaviour. We need, moreover, not only studies of persons in prison conditions, but studies of persons on probation and studies of predelinquent disorders.

We have, so far, concentrated largely on publicity work concerned with the recording of phenomena in the field of delinquent and criminal behaviour. Our aim will be to stimulate by the invitation of our pages the work of research into the various causes of antisocial conduct. Every science must go through its Linnaean stage of classifying, but there will be no progress unless we embark more freely and on a broad front on the study of causes, whether these be intimately psychological, social, or economic.

And even in the realm of therapy, whether this be penological,

psychotherapeutic, or through social rehabilitaton, we must encourage the study of what constitutes the most fruitful penology and, from the study of conditions under which amelioration can take place, discover the laws of ' correction ' and so provide our administrators with some measure of the long-term wisdom of their procedures.

In our leading reviews we hope from time to time to choose some outstanding book and make it the subject of full analytical criticism so that the Journal will stand not merely as a medium for the publication of researches and records, but as a forum for vital discussion. A learned journal can only too easily become a mausoleum for articles. Our subject is socially a vital one and we dare not allow it to become mummified. The Journal aims at being a meeting ground.

Our Advisory Board covers allied disciplines and we hope through its members to maintain a living contact with all the human sciences which must contribute to the advance of delinquency studies, and thereby satisfy the urgent need of rehabilitating the common offender.

In a large measure general psychopathological advances will find their place in other journals, but there are the significant problems of those frontier phenomena which have a relation to delinquency. For example, most child guidance clinics are in a position to study those neuroses and behaviour disorders which may pass over into delinquency. Their proper study is our concern, and Dr. Warren's article is a prelude to further enquiries. Sociology and demography tell us much about the effects of population drifts, change of rôle, rises and falls in economic security—all of which influence conduct until it may reach such a pitch of insecurity that asocial behaviour is prone to follow.

By our survey of the research projects being developed in different areas we hope to make clear to those about to embark on research where their colleagues are working and on what they are engaged. This should increase contact between research students and minimize unnecessary overlapping and fruitless reduplication of effort. Where parallel researches do occur, as is likely if research workers are encouraged to follow similar methods and use, for example, related statistical techniques, they can act as checks on one another and lead to the development of a true experimental method.

Some of our future numbers will be devoted to specific subjects. Symposia of this kind will not be ends in themselves but will suggest lines of enquiry. Later in the year we hope to have such a symposium on Psychopathic Personality, a subject which raises vital medico-legal issues.

* * *

The Second Part of Dr. Roper's Wakefield Survey which we are privileged

to publish in the present number raises too many fascinating issues to lend itself easily to brief editorial comment: problems of criminal psychology and psychiatry are closely linked to problems affecting the sentencing policy of the Courts and the programme of classification and treatment in prisons. Every reader will be aware of the highly selected character of the population of Wakefield, repeatedly stressed by the author himself; even so, nobody is likely to dispute the universal applicability of many of his discoveries among this group. Some of them present a clear confirmation of views generally held by penologists, such as Dr. Roper's remarks on the unfortunate results of very short or unduly long prison sentences. More often, however, the relations between his findings and those of other recent investigators would seem to be in need of further careful consideration. How, for example, does the effect of punishment on the immature personality so vividly described by the author, compare with the '*sentiment d'injustice subie*' which Professor de Greeff regards as one of the strongest criminogenic factors (see the reference on p. 222)? Is the low percentage figure of recidivists among sex offenders at Wakefield due simply to the selective effect of the classification system or is it, as suggested by Professor Tappan in the New Jersey Report on the habitual sex offender, contrary to the prevailing opinion a universal phenomenon? Are the facts brought out by Dr. Roper likely to provide some of the answers for which Sir Leo Page had been searching in vain in his study of twenty-three 'Young Lags'? How far do the predictions of likely recidivism made in the Wakefield survey correspond to those in the various Glueck studies? The need for large-scale prediction research with English case material, so convincingly stressed in Mr. Benson's article, is now becoming more and more generally accepted. Mr. Benson draws attention to the nucleus of information of a prognostic nature already available in the Annual Report of the Prison Commissioners. It is to be hoped that Dr. Roper and other workers in the field will eventually provide a more detailed and comprehensive body of facts for the construction of prediction tables on the lines of the Harvard studies.

In this connection an issue of considerable urgency is raised by Dr. Roper's insistence on the need for a reliable classification of delinquent states. As he points out, neither psychiatric, nor sociological, nor again legal standards provide of themselves a satisfactory basis for classification. Nor can satisfactory criteria be arrived at by determining the highest common factor of psychiatric, sociological and juridical agreement regarding the nature of delinquency. Following different approaches, frequently using different definitions and in the main serving different purposes, these applied sciences are bound to collide at some point of their approach to the problem. For this reason alone the search for a diagnostic and prognostic 'index'

is bound to end in some disappointment to all concerned. The law, for example, for reasons either of social or of moral expediency, chooses to regard certain forms of sexual conduct as social delinquencies rather than sexual disorders. Yet, as Dr. Roper rightly points out, the homosexual offenders coming under his observation were in other respects law-abiding, well-behaved and worthy citizens, who, he might well have added, attain and often promote a high level of cultural achievement. Clearly then the inclusion of this group in any study of a 'delinquent' population is bound to broaden greatly the margin of error incident to such investigations, if indeed it does not reduce 'delinquent typology' to nonsense. Nor will the working distinction of 'pathological'[1] from 'non-pathological' delinquency eliminate this error. The burden of Dr. Roper's observations of a prison population selected not so much on psychiatric grounds as because the prospects of ultimate social adaptation appeared favourable is that the pathological factors found in such a mixed group are very similar to those found in groups selected for treatment (as at the *Portman Clinic I.S.T.D.*) exclusively because of their pathological characteristics. Dr. Roper, in effect, maintains that the distinction between 'pathological' and 'non-pathological' crime, however politic from the point of view of criminal responsibility, is arbitrary and confusing, as indeed in some respects it is.

To take another example: the term 'recidivism', although generally used to denote a category of delinquent behaviour, is, psychiatrically regarded, a misnomer, certainly in cases of crime that are manifestly of pathological origin. Translated into psychiatric terms, recidivism refers only to the *duration* of any disease of which delinquent behaviour is a symptom. It means merely that in its later stages the course of the disease tends to be intermittent. To be sure the treatment meted out to the delinquent may promote or aggravate recidivism; or again it may reduce recidivism. But these facts can better be appreciated if we say quite simply that treatment may prolong or shorten the disease. To regard recidivism as if it were a particular form of social perversity noted in certain delinquent types may be socially expedient, but it offends every canon of psychiatric diagnosis.

Happily these difficulties in definition and classification are not entirely insurmountable. We can always follow the example of those clinical observers who, in forming a diagnosis, take into account constitutional, predisposing, and precipitating causes, including both individual and environmental (social) factors. In other words, the most reliable variety of classification

[1] The term 'pathological delinquency' implies that the offence in question is either one of the symptoms of a current mental or physical disorder or itself constitutes the sole symptom thereof.

is an etiological one. Even so, the most painstaking diagnosis should be constantly checked by an assessment of the soundness of socio-legal standards. In organic medicine the diagnostic methods may be fallible but at least there is no uncertainty regarding the *existence* of disease. Not so in social psychiatry. Along with the uncertainties of sociological and psychological diagnosis must be reckoned the variability of social *mores*, and the emotional nature of social prejudices. A good classification must make due correction for the errors of social assessment, reprobation or expediency.

* * *

M. Marc Ancel's brief but important contribution to the volume in honour of the great Swedish penologist Dr. Karl Schlyter, reviewed below, may make criminologists in this country ponder why, since the end of the nineteenth century, the penal reform movement has developed on different lines here from those followed on the Continent. The explanation may be that Britain, having established no University Chairs of Criminal Law, has never possessed in this field anything comparable to that vast body of theoretical literature which, ranging from painstaking discussions of the great principles of penal philosophy to the analysis of the minutest details of legal interpretation, has for so many generations been a conspicuous feature of continental law libraries. Academic teaching of the Criminal Law being so greatly neglected, there were no theorists to participate in the controversies. Their place was largely taken by the publications of Royal Commissions and Departmental Committees studying practical issues and preparing the ground for the legislator, and as a consequence already the first of the three stages described by M. Marc Ancel, namely, that ending in 1914, had a legislative rather than an academic character. Within the brief space of ten years, an impressive number of Acts of Parliament were passed, all of them designed to serve the interests both of Society and of the individual criminal: the Prison Act of 1898, the Probation of Offenders Act of 1907, the Children's Act of 1908, and the Prevention of Crime Act of 1908. It is interesting to observe, however, that notwithstanding this pre-occupation with practical issues, the theoretical struggle between the two conflicting penological schools of thought to which M. Marc Ancel refers is occasionally reflected in the work of the English legislator of that period: not so distinctly in the Prison Act which, as Mr. Fox has pointed out in his contribution to the same volume, added the object of reform to that of deterrence, nor in the Probation or Children Acts, but in the ill-fated 'double-track' system of Preventive Detention under the Prevention of Crime Act. It is here that it has taken the English legislator forty years to

reach, in the Criminal Justice Act of 1948, that third stage, M. Marc Ancel's '*phase de synthèse*', which brings to an end '*la querelle insoluble entre les tenants du dualisme ou de l'unitarisme de la sanction répressive*' by introducing a measure of social defence which should, at the same time, protect the public and rehabilitate the offender. Whether the efforts of the Prison Commissioners, described in their latest Report (see below under 'Notes') will be successful in practice it is too early to judge.

* * *

In pursuance of its policy of developing an adequate teaching centre for the training of workers in the field of delinquency, and acting as an organizing centre for the development and correlation of research on the subject, the *I.S.T.D.* is faced with the necessity of raising its Library, the use of which is at present confined to students attending lecture courses, to the status of a Bibliographical Centre. To lighten the cost of increasing reading and lending facilities, readers of this *Journal* are earnestly desired to support these projects by donating to the *I.S.T.D.* Library such books and sets of periodicals as they can spare from their private collections. Standard works and research monographs dealing with psychological, psychiatric, educational, sociological, anthropological and juridical aspects of delinquency are expressly solicited. The new library will be known as the *E. T. Jensen Memorial Library.*

Equally important from the point of view of research is the preparation of an index of cross-references to which recourse may be had by workers embarking on new projects of research and by those about to prepare scientific articles or monographs based on current observations. It is generally agreed that the habit of compiling extensive lists of references, while lending a specious air of erudition to scientific papers, if practised exclusively on a subject basis and without any indication of the comparative value of the contributions, may end either by depressing the reader or by irritating him. More unfortunate still, it encourages the questionable practice of unverified citation, and in many instances gives an unnecessarily long lease of life to opinions and conclusions that have outlived their usefulness. To the familiar exhortation 'Verify your references' might well be added the injunction 'Evaluate and purge your references'. It should be the main concern of a Bibliographical Centre to provide research workers and clinical writers with discriminating lists of references. Before this can be done it is necessary not only to have a well-stocked library of books, journals and abstracts but to enlist the aid of bibliographical enthusiasts prepared to devote some of their time to this arduous but important task. The *Institute*, though hampered in many directions by lack of resources, is proud of its status as a voluntary organization.

A COMPARATIVE SURVEY OF THE WAKEFIELD PRISON POPULATION IN 1948 & 1949[1]

PART II

By W. F. ROPER (WAKEFIELD)

In Part I of this survey [2] the Wakefield population was compared with that at Dartmoor, with the prison population at large, and with a control group of prison officer candidates. Since then the full tables have been worked out and cross-tabulated; the opportunity has been taken to include 500 cases examined in 1949 and to discard the 214 earliest cases in which a shorter profile was used. The present series therefore, comprises 1,100 cases all examined as fully as our means allow. No external comparisons have been made in this extended series; we have not had sufficient free time to examine the control group in greater detail than that given in Part I, largely because the demands of clinical work are rising.

One of the results of close examination is that opportunities for treatment are found; having discovered something that can be done, a clinician will naturally try to do it; thus it is that research and treatment complement and reinforce each other. Medicine has always advanced in this way and there is no reason why clinical criminology should not follow suit, once its claims to be a distinctive field of study and practice have been recognized.

Some day this recognition must come—the field is large enough and important enough to demand it—and advances should then be rapid; but we are still largely in the pre-scientific stage of good intentions, guided mainly by trial and error. The ground has not been adequately surveyed, nor have discrete problems been accurately delimited for separate study as in the case of disease in medicine; classification and terminology are inexact when not absent; and it is probable that no one could write a satisfactory manual of diagnosis and treatment comparable even to the medical textbooks of a century ago. In making this comparison with medicine it is not implied that crime is a disease in the sense that illnesses are diseases, but it is a maladjustment to society, wearing many different aspects and affecting many different types of people, which requires diagnosis and research into ætiology in just the same way as does disease. Personally I do not believe that anyone *wants* to be a criminal; crime starts, as I have seen it, as a reaction to frustration and much more often than not ends with the crisis that follows dis-

[1] I am indebted to the Prison Commissioners for permission to publish this article, but permission does not imply that it represents their views.

[2] This *Journal*, July, 1950.

covery. It is true that special determinants are usually necessary before a frustration reaction will take the form of crime, and thereby hangs a vast problem of prevention which must ultimately lead to much re-thinking about the structure of modern society, particularly in regard to the family, since, as was shown in Part I, it is in the family that the seeds of trouble are sown, to germinate later if the climate proves favourable.

Where the crisis of discovery does not put an end to criminality, which it fails to do in some 20 per cent. of cases, society is faced with the possibility of an anti-social reaction which may take ten or twenty years, or more, before it burns itself out, partly because crime can be made profitable, and partly because the original frustration situation, if unresolved, is apt to become worse as disgrace and punishment accumulate. The self-regard of the criminal becomes involved in persisting in doing what he has been forbidden to do, since to yield is to face and acknowledge an accumulation of shame and guilt which is beyond his power to digest. It is surprising how even hardened offenders will temporarily change once they can be shown some way out of this difficulty; and ultimately most do find some way out when they reach real maturity of mind. But in adolescent and young adult life, particularly when the urge to self-assertion is at its height, any change made is apt to be fugitive. The tyranny of habit and the jeers of companions have to be faced, so that it is easier for the criminal to resume the mask of cynicism and toughness and to lie on the uneasy but accustomed bed which he has made for himself. Only a sustained effort aimed at both the group and the individual can promise real results in the case of the recidivist or the recidivist-to-be and this effort must reach down to the undoing of the original frustration which lies at the bottom of it all; a tenfold rather than a redoubled effort will be necessary before this can be done; and the first need is for more systematized knowledge.

It will be easier for those law-abiding persons who find some difficulty in understanding why the criminal persists in error, and to whom it seems so obvious that the only decent thing to do is to admit the fault and correct it, if they reflect on the persistence in error common in lesser, non-criminal affairs. Most of us are doing something wrong or inefficient and most of us have friends or enemies who will tell us about our faults; but advice, threats, blandishments or retaliation may easily serve to fix our persistence in error rather than to decrease it. To yield is to admit; and admissions hurt our vanity. Wrong-headedness is no prerogative of the criminal; we all have our share. Most doctors, for instance, can produce patients who are eating, drinking, or worrying themselves into the grave. It is much the same with the criminal; with him the reproof is sharper and the shame more public, but this only fixes him in error the more surely if he sets his

vanity against common-sense, or if his underlying frustration is too great to be overcome.

These remarks are prompted in this context by the fact that Wakefield is now taking more potential recidivists, as is shown in Table III, and in consequence the task of understanding and trying to avoid recidivism will become much more urgent than it was in the past, when some 85 per cent. of prisoners could be expected to correct themselves.

Corrective Trainees (specially selected) have started to arrive, but, even without them, there are more potential recidivists in the Wakefield population than formerly. For the purpose of this survey this has the advantage of providing a better sample of prisoners to be offered in Table IV, which sets out the findings of the survey largely in terms of the recidivist tendency. It is not feasible to bring in the full cross-tabulation owing to its length and complexity, but portions of it will be referred to when appropriate.

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE 1948 AND 1949 POPULATION

TABLE III. CHANGES IN THE WAKEFIELD POPULATION

Category	*Wakefield Population,* 1948	*Wakefield Population,* 1949	*Corrective Trainees,* 1949
Total number involved. . .	**600**	**500**	**86**
Under thirty at present conviction.	54	57	74
Under twenty-one at first conviction	28	38	70
Sentence of over two years . .	45	61	47
Been to prison, Borstal or approved school	18	37	86
Subnormal intelligence . .	46	43	34
Positive mental history. . .	15	23	28
Instability (mild or marked) . .	26	35	34

(Percentages except where in bold type.)

The average age is falling slightly and is likely to fall further as more Corrective Trainees arrive. Wakefield seems likely to become mainly a prison for young adults, which often means some decline in the smoothness of discipline. Older men of any type are in favour of a quiet life; but the younger men may prefer change and excitement so that it is much to the credit of the administration that now, at the end of 1950, when the change has gone further, no essential alteration has had to be made in the Wakefield system; the challenge, so far, has been met.

The general length of sentences has increased and so has the number of men with previous experience of penal establishments. The average standard of intelligence is a little higher, but the proportion of men giving a history of psychiatric treatment and showing evidence of instability has increased. The population in 1949 was younger than before, less stable, had more experience of crime and punishment, and received longer sentences.

RECIDIVIST TENDENCY (TABLE IV)

Table IV shows the findings for the total series in the first column. In the next three columns the series has been split into three categories: those assessed as unlikely to return to crime, those who may possibly return to crime, and those who will probably return to crime. By running the eye across the column it will be possible to see the factors which affect recidivism ascending or descending in value as the case may be.

The assessment is a clinical one, made at interview, and is probably the best means of classification available at present because it can take individual factors into consideration in a way which is impossible if an index of criminality like that of the Gluecks is used. However, it is not desirable to rest solely on an assessment, so in the next three columns the series is broken up into the three objective categories, namely, those who have never before been convicted, those who have been convicted before but not confined in a penal establishment, and those who have been to an Approved School, Borstal or Prison. It will be found that the factors move across these columns in much the same way as they do in the assessment columns.

The Age Factor (*Table IV*, *Section* 1)

In the assessment columns there is a smooth and steady rise in the number of men under thirty years of age as one reads from left to right; the criminal record columns show the same, except that there is a small decline in the third column, due, probably, to the inclusion in that column of men of mature age who have prison records of some standing, but who have been thought to be sufficiently good prospects to send to Wakefield.

Turning to the age at first conviction, there is a steady rise in both assessment and criminal record columns. The differences are marked and show that the likely recidivist tends to start young. It was pointed out in Part I that crime can usefully be considered as the persistence of an immature attitude; the likely recidivist is he who is not mature enough to reconstruct his self-regard in such a way as to accept correction.

To take the matter a little further, the proportion offending before the age of seventeen was worked out for the whole series and for the Corrective Trainees and the Dartmoor series. The figures are 24 per cent. for the whole

TABLE IV. GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS AND RECIDIVIST TENDENCY

Category	*Wakefield prisoners, 1948–49*	*Assessed as unlikely to return*	*Assessed as possible returns*	*Assessed as probable returns*	*With no previous convictions*	*Previously convicted but not confined*	*Previously in prison*
Total number included	**1,100**	**461**	**434**	**205**	**511**	**296**	**293**
1. *Age*							
Under 30 at present conviction	56	40	58	84	43	66	62
Under 21 at first conviction	32	14	38	63	3	50	66
2. *Sentence*							
Sentence of over two years	53	53	57	42	54	46	53
3. *Offences*							
Wounding, grevious bodily harm and homicide	13	19	12	6	18	11	7
Robbery with violence	7	4	8	10	7	7	6
Unnatural offences	9	11	13	2	17	5	4
Other sex offences	14	22	11	7	16	16	8
Breaking and entering	26	13	30	48	13	31	43
Larceny, receiving and miscellaneous theft	17	17	14	20	15	17	17
Fraud and forgery	11	12	11	5	11	10	13
Miscellaneous offences	3	3	1	2	3	3	2
4. *Attitude to Conviction*							
Denial or partial denial of guilt	16	20	17	9	19	17	11
Complaint of length of sentence	54	45	57	72	47	60	62
Acceptance of Conviction and sentence	30	35	26	19	34	63	27
5. *Criminal Record*							
No previous convictions	46	73	35	11	100	—	—
Previously convicted but not confined	27	20	35	25	—	100	—
Been to prison, Borstal or approved school	27	7	30	64	—	—	100
6. *Expectation of Recidivism*							
Unlikely to return to crime	42	100	—	—	66	31	11
May possibly return	39	—	100	—	30	51	45
Will probably return	19	—	—	100	4	18	44
7. *Work, School and Military Records*							
Unsatisfactory work record	40	18	46	71	16	51	53
Unsatisfactory school record	32	18	40	52	16	51	53
Military failure (percentage of those who served)	57	41	63	82	45	66	69
8. *Habits and Companions*							
Drinker	37	30	40	46	34	46	40
Bad companions	44	23	42	70	24	48	62
9. *Marital Relationships*							
Single	42	32	47	52	40	45	43
Separated or divorced (percentage of those who married)	27	22	30	29	22	37	25
Disharmonious union (percentage of those married)	63	61	62	71	62	67	65
10. *Home and Cultural Background*							
Definitely adverse early home	46	31	51	68	35	52	58
Middle class	3	4	2	—	4	1	2
Subcultural	8	7	7	7	7	8	8
Parental alcoholism	20	14	22	28	17	25	26
Father hostility	31	29	34	32	31	27	35
Mother ambivalence	24	21	28	22	22	26	27
Sibling jealousy	24	22	24	21	23	27	21
Only child	6	7	7	2	7	5	5
11. *Health*							
Fit for less than full labour	8	11	9	3	10	8	3
With positive venereal history	16	13	15	21	12	18	13
Considered delicate as a child	6	9	7	2	9	9	1
12. *Mental Condition*							
Subnormal intelligence	45	43	48	42	38	56	48
Instability (mild or marked)	30	25	32	36	26	34	29
Positive mental history	18	12	21	24	14	21	22
Neurotic	12	11	11	12	13	11	6
Psychopathic	8	2	8	20	5	9	11

(Percentages except where in bold type.)

of the Wakefield series, 47 per cent. for the Corrective Trainees, and 48 per cent. for the Dartmoor series considered in Part I. About half the recidivists, therefore, begin as juvenile or early adolescent offenders and consolidate their previous reaction in later adolescence. The impression is gained that if initial treatment fails it is not only so much lost; failure militates against successful treatment later. It seems of the greatest importance to do the best possible job at the beginning. Cursory attention to a first offence may be a great mistake.

Length of Sentence (*Table IV, Section* 2)

It will be seen that length of sentence bears no relation to the recidivist tendency, or even to the criminal record. Sentences seem to be based largely on the character of the offence, rather than on that of the offender. In the assessment column the likeliest return cases show the shortest sentences, chiefly because they are mostly housebreakers and thieves who are likely to get off more lightly than do many other types of offender. The criminal law is primarily a system of discipline which aims to put down some offences with greater severity than others and this aspect of its operation may override any other. A man who has attempted murder may be quite unlikely to repeat his offence under any circumstances, but his conduct has to be shown to be more reprehensible than theft for the purpose of social discipline. This is a complication in the treatment of offenders which has to be accepted in the present state of society.

Offences Committed (*Table IV, Section* 3)

The offence favoured by the probable recidivist at Wakefield is breaking and entering, as will readily be seen from the table. In corroboration of this it may be mentioned that 63 per cent. of the Corrective Trainees and 40 per cent. of the Dartmoor prisoners favour this kind of crime, chiefly because it readily lends itself to organization and gives scope for planning and preparation. Larceny and other forms of dishonesty are, of course, more frequent in crime as a whole, but breaking and entering is the chief professional crime, and when a man has learnt how to open safes he regards himself as at the top of his profession. There is a great deal to learn about the psychopathology of breaking and entering; some men get a very definite and unhealthy thrill from it.

Robbery with violence moves less surely in the same direction. It is often an impulsive affair associated with drink; or, when handbags are snatched, it is often a quasi-sexual offence, which will repay some intensive study. In the Corrective Trainee group only 1 per cent. were robbers and in the Dartmoor group only 4 per cent.; so that it seems to be, on the whole,

an amateur crime. The robbers were the youngest group of all (84 per cent. under thirty) and 62 per cent. of them had no previous convictions. Fifty-seven per cent. were drinkers and 58 per cent. had a definitely adverse early home background—worse than that of any other type of offender. They were severely punished, 82 per cent. having sentences of over two years, again the highest proportion of all offenders. Sixty per cent. were recorded as having bad companions; youth, drink, a dissolute life, and a bad upbringing, seem to be the hall-mark of this particular crime as seen at Wakefield.

The figures for wounding and homicide move against recidivism. Only 6 per cent. of the Dartmoor group and none of the Corrective Trainees were convicted of violence to the person. Most crimes of violence have definite situation determinants and 62 per cent. of the Wakefield series were first offenders, unlikely to repeat their offence. Only 9 per cent. were given a bad rating as likely to return to crime. Violence to the person has a high association with psychopathy, particularly with psychopathy of the schizoid and aggressive types. There is a more faulty home background than usual (54 per cent. against the average 46 per cent. of definitely adverse homes) and the pathological implications are obvious enough. As a rule this form of crime is the simplest to understand and the easiest to reduce to its historical determinants.

Sexual offences go against recidivism, especially in the case of unnatural offences (almost wholly homosexual with an occasional case of bestiality). There are many different types of homosexual and it would not do to accept the Wakefield type as standard, because the debased men either do not arrive or, if they do, are removed. The male prostitute is not represented at all and there are relatively few cultists and sexual athletes; the majority of the Wakefield homosexuals are worthy men apart from their kink. They settle down to their fate, generally speaking, with more philosophy than most, and profit a great deal more from prison life than do most offenders. Few of them feel much temptation in prison, partly because the boys in whom most of them are interested are not available, but much more because of self-disgust. All of them are explored, and those who are suitable and willing receive psychological treatment. If their sexual inclination cannot be reversed they mostly come to see the problem in terms of self-control. like that of any other offender.

The homosexuals are somewhat sharply demarcated from the general run of prisoners by their antecedents and personality. Seventy-seven per cent. are single, only 35 per cent. are of subnormal intelligence; 75 per cent. have no previous convictions and they have better work and service records. Seventy-five per cent. are classed as of inadequate personality, and the chief family factor is mother identification. Many of them are interested solely

in boys and youths, for whom they have a quasi-maternal tenderness which would be admirable if it stopped short of sexual fondling. They (with the frauds) comprise almost the whole of the small middle-class contingent in the prison; schoolmasters, scoutmasters and choirmasters are strongly represented. They are much interested in religion and remain rather much mothers' good boys. Those who are interested in their equals in age are not, as a rule, of so good a type—cultism and sexual athleticism is likely to have crept in.

They are heavily punished, being exceeded in this respect only by the robbers and by those who do violence to the person. They have the average 17 per cent. history of venereal disease, contributed chiefly by those who are not really inverts; the better men usually stop short at masturbation; sodomists are often of a cruder type. There were only 6 per cent. of homosexuals in the Dartmoor series, all of a very different type to the run of Wakefield prisoner. The Wakefield type of offender does not seem to return.

The heterosexual offenders are a very varied group, with rape and attempted rape prominent, but with a fair contingent of incest cases. As a group they are low in intelligence, more than usually inadequate in personality, and contain the highest proportion of sub-culturals (21 per cent. as against the average of 8 per cent.). Seventy-two per cent. are married and 83 per cent. of these have either separated or had marriage trouble before the offence. Many of the single men are uncouth and maladjusted persons incapable of normal courtship. There were only 5 per cent. of heterosexual offenders at Dartmoor, and the trend is against recidivism.

A very high proportion (45 per cent.) of the heterosexual offenders protest their innocence, often on the grounds that what they did was done with consent. A good deal more shame is felt by heterosexual offenders than by other sexual delinquents. Inadequacy, stupidity and subculture are the main characteristics of the group.

Fraud and forgery run on the whole against recidivism. The largest sub-group is composed of those who defraud the Post Office with forged bank books; this seems to be a most insidious form of crime, and they are a nondescript sub-group. Apart from these, most of the men are of a respectable type and are very unlikely to offend again, though, of course there is quite another type of fraud and forger who does become a recidivist (7 per cent. at Dartmoor). Members of the fraud group are usually older than most, more intelligent and come from better early homes.

Consideration of space precludes a detailed study of the housebreaker, receiver and thief. These constitute the big battalions, and a good deal of work will be necessary before they can be split up into different types.

The miscellaneous category comprises a hotch-potch of offences, too small in number to list separately. It includes a very interesting arson group which is marked for special study. It is sufficient to say here that when arson is not done for profit or for concealment there is usually a marked element of sexual frustration.

Attitude to Conviction and Sentence (*Table IV, Section* 4)

One of the most characteristic distinctions between prisoners is their attitude to conviction and sentence. Some men concentrate on allegations that their conviction was unfair in that they did not do all that was alleged against them, or that points which they consider would have told in their favour were not brought out at the trial. Occasionally, but only occasionally, there are allegations of a complete miscarriage of justice. Animus against the judiciary or prosecuting counsel is rather rare and not particularly common against the police; the unsuccessful defending counsel is perhaps the commonest target for criticism. Quite a number of men who claim innocence or partial innocence pleaded guilty at their trial, and indulged later in regrets, building up a phantasy defence which they flatter themselves would have been successful.

The reaction of denial, or partial denial, of guilt is of complex origin, arising partly out of the circumstances of the case, but very much more out of its nature and the personality of the man concerned. It is particularly high in heterosexual offences (45 per cent. as against the average 16 per cent.) and falls to its lowest in the professional crime of breaking and entering. The biggest factor is reluctance to admit the breaking of a taboo: most incest cases will deny guilt if they see the slightest hope of being believed; in cases of rape and indecent assault on females there is often a tacit agreement between a man and his wife to deny his guilt and to base their future on that fiction; a complication may also arise when, as sometimes happens, the victim may have contributed to the crime by permitting some degree of privacy or intimacy before trying to call a halt to it. Type of personality is also a factor, and the hysteroids, with their ready tendency to adopt fictions, are particularly prone to assert innocence. However, only those of distinctly paranoid tendency try to make much out of it, and most of those who claim innocence or partial innocence get on with their punishment quite readily, provided their fiction is not too directly challenged; it is a special art to be able to lay bare to them the determinants of their conduct without a direct challenge. This kind of recapitulation of their history is usually attempted at the reception interview, and they will often tend to drop the whole fiction thereafter, with a corresponding gain in stability; but the recapitulation has to be very gently done.

What these men are really trying to do is to defend their self-respect, and they can only drop the fiction of innocence if they are shown some way of accepting their guilt without undue distress. The fact that they have so sensitive a self-respect argues well for the future and a protest of innocence is often a good sign; the incidence of it runs against recidivism.

The effort of the man likely to become a recidivist is to argue against the length of his sentence; complaints of this kind are characteristic of recidivism. There is not sufficient sensitivity of conscience to make a desperate effort to deny the guilt worth while, but the ' injustice neurosis ' from which most prisoners suffer comes out in complaint against the sentence. Like the protest of innocence, it is something which needs to be taken up with the prisoner at interview with a view to its correction. Punishment, however well deserved, is an affront and needs to be digested; if it is not, it is readily built up into a wrong and can become a fixating agent in perverse behaviour; the feeling is that, right or wrong, they have been challenged and that toughness demands that they shall not submit. Prisoners are not peculiar in this reaction; plenty of other people take correction badly and resent it; they, like the prisoner, may be prepared to admit the fault, but they resent the inferiority of having to accept the punishment this involves, and react accordingly. It is not enough to punish; the punishment has also to be presented in the right way and a long and careful interview, or series of interviews, is necessary; often it is not possible to get a useful result.

The third general attitude is that of acceptance of both conviction and sentence; and here extremes meet, in the best and the worst. The best accept the conviction and punishment because they can see some future before them and can feel some kind of gratitude that they have been able to see a way to correct their faults; the worst accept conviction and sentence because they are not much upset at the disgrace and realize that it is far more comfortable not to kick against the pricks. With this latter class of men little can be done; the former class are the salt of the prison and the more who can be made to enter it, the better the prison.

It has to be emphasized that the matter of self-respect or vanity is the fundamental problem; if a man can bear to face his disgrace, and write off his errors to experience without animosity, he is likely to do well. But if he cannot bear to do this, and if it is not, or cannot be made, possible for him to do it, he can only continue the denials and rationalizations by which he protects his self-esteem and accept himself as a black sheep in the eyes of others. There is an enormous field of work here; if punishment is felt to imply rejection, or subordination to people who are disliked, it works erratically.

Criminal Record and Expectation of Recidivism (*Table IV, Sections* 5 *and* 6)

It will be seen that though the criminal record and the assessment of recidivism march well together, they are by no means identical. Eleven per cent. of men with no previous convictions are considered likely to return, most of them because they have been on the edge of trouble for a long time. Taken the other way round, 11 per cent. of those who have had previous penal experience are thought not likely to return, and 45 per cent. of such men were assessed as doubtful, leaving 44 per cent. considered likely to return. The majority of the former prisoners who are favourably assessed have had previous short sentences which they have quickly forgotten. It takes time to alter an attitude to life; it is not sufficient to have a shock and see what needs to be done; if that were all, New Year resolutions would last much longer than they do; the resolution has to sink in and percolate throughout the personality and this takes time, particularly in younger men and adolescents, many of whom only begin to show a real advance after two or three years. Punishment, if it is to be used, needs to be used for effect. Punishment easily borne merely immunizes against further punishment, and short sentences ought not to be imposed when there is no real expectation that they will have much effect on the prisoner concerned. Attention was drawn in Part I to the number of such useless sentences in the background of the Dartmoor recidivists. On the other hand, it is doubtful whether a longer sentence than six years (four years after deduction of remission) ever helps in treatment, as opposed to preventive detention and the vindication of social standards. Possibly the indeterminate sentence is the answer; but, as is well known, the subject bristles with difficulties, chief of which is the lack of proper criteria of recovery from criminality.

The publication of the Gluecks' work on a prognostic index has raised great interest in recent years and the cases in this series have been recast in a form suitable for examination as to whether a prognostic index can be extracted from them. Return or non-return to prison will be noted after two, five, and ten years, and the statistics then re-analysed. A start on this may be possible at the end of 1951. The virtue of such a statistical index lies in avoiding the errors of subjective assessment; the defect is that it perforce leaves a good many imponderables out of account; if a valid index is found the result can only be that we shall be able to say that a man belongs to a group of persons X per cent. of whom do not return to crime after some particular form of treatment. The index will not show whether the man concerned will be in the X per cent. or the 100 — X per cent. group. Such an index will have to be treated like a laboratory finding in medicine; that is, as a valuable aid, but not as the full deciding factor.

Work, School and Military Record (Table IV, Section 7)

An unsatisfactory work record runs strongly with both the recidivist ssessment and the criminal record. By an unsatisfactory work record is meant wilful unemployment, frequent changes of job, and misbehaviour or inefficiency when in work. Two main classes of men emerge, those who are basically inefficient and uninterested in work, and those who have expensive tastes and scorn the usual rewards. The former drift into difficulty, the latter embrace methods of getting rich quickly, even though they may be quite efficient men. Imprisonment may help the one class by getting them used to steady employment and the other by getting them used to a frugal existence. But the disciplinary environment is so very different under free conditions, that the new habits are often not transferable. A bad work record is one of the more sinister factors in prognosis, perhaps the most sinister after the criminal record itself.

An unsatisfactory school record also runs with the recidivist tendency. Inefficiency and rebellion are freely transferred from the home to the school and the schoolmaster has to cope with the parents' failure. The school group, also, is likely to have enough maladjusted children to form an underworld which goes its own way. One is tempted to think that a great enlargement of the functions of the education authorities is needed and that they will have to be given the duty of, and the the facilities for, picking out and adjusting in a more comprehensive way than is now possible children whose homes fail them. Preventive child and family guidance in the formative years, whilst the warping process is still in action, would be cheaper and more rational than attempted cure later.

Failure to be a useful sailor, soldier, or airman, runs strongly with the recidivist tendency, whether the failure is evidenced in repeated absence without leave, or in insubordination, or in psychopathy. Some of the men are distinctly unstable, some too stupid to learn, others intolerant of discipline, and a few just so selfish that they will be damned rather than fight for someone else. Inefficiency rather than rebellion is, perhaps, the greater factor, but the underlying defect is the failure to be caught up by the *esprit de corps* of the unit. The criminal is an egotistical person as a rule and does not cohere readily to a normal group. No doubt experience of a divided home is basically responsible; the criminal is a person who readily feels rejected and ' out of it '; he readily makes up his mind that he is not really wanted and acts accordingly. The result is that he becomes, in actual fact, unwanted. These military failures must all have been far more trouble than they were worth and must have been a source of considerable weakness in the Services. It is interesting that the sexual offenders show the least number of failures and the robbers and housebreakers the most. Homosexuals

are often quite good soldiers despite the apparent effeminacy of some of them; they are determined to keep up with the other man and are quite prepared to follow where others will lead; and some of them are distinctly unselfish people, in marked contrast to the robbers and housebreakers.

It is a pity that the only way out of the Army for so many of these military failures was through psychiatric channels. Once labelled neurotic or psychopathic, they are presented with a ready excuse for misbehaviour by pleading that they could not help it. This plea can be met only with the explanation that in that event they will have to exert themselves doubly, to get rid of both the criminality and the psychopathy; but one can hardly take this line unless treatment is available.

Habits and Companions (*Table IV, Section* 8)

Of all the various bad habits, drinking is the only one sufficiently important and separable from a generally careless way of life to be statistically analysable. Even so, one has to be careful of accepting drink as an ætiological factor of importance because it is so often used as a salve to self-esteem when something disgraceful has been done. In the current coin of excuse, drink is often accepted as changing disgrace into folly, and so this explanation is readily tendered. A prisoner was, therefore, not regarded as a drinker unless drink had contributed definitely to his crime or to the situation which he attempted to solve by crime; such situations were extravagant living and companionship with loose people. Drink acts in two ways: it removes self-control and it creates economic need because it is costly; the one action reinforces the other.

The chief characteristics of the drinker are set out in Table V.

TABLE V. CHARACTERISTICS OF DRINKERS

Characteristic	*Whole Series*	*Drinkers*
	(per cent.)	(per cent.)
Single	42	49
Subnormal intelligence	45	51
Positive venereal history	16	21
Definitely adverse early home background	46	52
Robbery with violence	7	11
Military failure	42	49
Bad companions	46	50
Unsatisfactory work record	40	44
Unsatisfactory school record	32	42

The higher proportion of definitely adverse early homes, of poor school records, and subnormality of intelligence, suggests that there is an underlying defect of personality in the drinker since all these conditions antedate the drinking. No special tendency is shown to any kind of offence except robbery, often an impulsive and ill-considered act, undertaken under the influence of drink, without which there would not have been a willingness to do personal violence for gain. The incidence of venereal disease is higher than average, doubtless because of carelessness whilst in drink. The drinking habit runs in favour of recidivism.

As one would expect, bad companionship is a strongly marked factor associated with the recidivist tendency. The criminal is one who is apt to feel rejected from ordinary groups; he is, therefore, either solitary, or he gravitates to special groups of his own kind where his self-esteem is not continually challenged; only so can he live comfortably. This is one explanation of the gross ingratitude which may be met with in criminals. They are compelled to be ungrateful for reasons of inner balance; in order not to feel inferior they have to write down the generosity of others as foolishness, or as having an ulterior motive. The point has been made before, but is worth re-emphasizing, that the black sheep is apt to feel that he cannot go back because of the shame which he will have to digest if he gives up his cynicism and swagger. He will therefore behave most ungratefully, and anyone who expects normal reactions from such people is expecting the impossible. When criminals have learnt to give and take in a normal manner they are well on the way to recovery, so it is no use being put off by initial ingratitude.

The special attributes of the 44 per cent. recorded as having bad companions are that breaking and entering is their favoured crime (41 per cent., as against the average 26 per cent.) and that they have inferior military, work and school records. The factors of drink and bad companionship are also highly associated.

Marital Relationship (*Table IV, Section* 9)

The single state goes with the recidivist tendency largely because of the age factor already considered; the single men are younger. The striking feature of the series as a whole is the dreadful mess in which the married men are usually involved. Twenty-seven per cent. of their marriages are broken and in 63 per cent. there is chronic disharmony. The underlying factors are immaturity and selfishness. They marry, often in haste and unsuitably, for what they think they can get, and not for what they have to give, so that the marriage contract, which needs so much give and take, is doomed from the beginning. It does seem odd that people marry and

beget children without any suitability for the function; but we do not know what happens to these children and it may be that their fathers serve as a warning to them rather than as an example.

Broken and disharmonious marriages do not go very strongly with recidivism because so many associated crimes are offences of violence, or heterosexual offences, which do not tend to be repeated; the offence itself is often a direct reaction to the marriage frustration, and criminality of this kind is likely to end with the crisis of exposure. It is noteworthy that many men change markedly if their family tangles can be sorted out. Often wives and relatives will rally strongly to a man who has been punished, and this by itself may lead to a considerable change of heart. It may also, in other cases, be sadly exploited.

Home and Cultural Background (*Table IV, Section* 10)

The great influence of the home background of criminality was brought out fully in Part I. The mind of the child is formed in the matrix of the home much as his body is formed in the matrix of his mother. If the foundations of personality have been soundly laid, the child will be able to resist all ordinary temptations, just as his body may be expected to stand up to all ordinary physical stresses. A definitely adverse home background goes quite strongly with recidivism, and by a definitely adverse home is meant not only a broken or vicious home, but a home where any kind of gross mishandling, like undue repression or undue indulgence, has plainly warped development.

The number of prisoners coming from a middle-class environment is 3 per cent.—too small for any very definite conclusions. For what it is worth, this factor goes against recidivism. The men concerned were much older (only 30 per cent under 30) and more intelligent (only 10 per cent. of subnormal intelligence); 73 per cent. had never been convicted before, and only 30 per cent. are noted as coming from definitely adverse homes. Fifty per cent. came in for fraud and forgery and 34 per cent. for unnatural offences. Instability may occur amongst some of them, in the early days of their sentences, because the crash is apt to be so catastrophic for a man who has been in a position of trust which he is hardly likely to regain. However, these men have a compensation in that their greater intellectual resources enable them to get more out of books, and qualify them for the more responsible jobs open to a prisoner. On the whole they make a good adaptation and contribute a valuable element to the prisoner group.

At the opposite pole are the subculturals (8 per cent. of the whole group). This group is distinguished by the high incidence of subnormal intelligence

(79 per cent.), by the special adversity of the early homes (63 per cent. definitely adverse), and by their special liability to heterosexual offences (39 per cent., against the average of 14 per cent.). It includes most of the cases of incest, thereby emphasizing the freedom of this group from some customary taboos. The factor seems neutral as to recidivism, probably because of the high proportion of sexual offenders who are not likely to become recidivists. It is interesting to note that 89 per cent. of the total population came from the large mass of artisans and labouring families, neither well off nor unduly depressed. Poverty, *per se*, does not seem to be a main factor in crime.

Parental alcoholism turned up with sufficient frequency to be statistically noticed; almost always the father was involved. The factor runs with recidivism and is especially linked with early entry into crime (42 per cent. before the age of 21 as against the average of 32 per cent.). The association with a definitely adverse home is marked (75 per cent. against the average of 46 per cent.); there is a less marked association with inferior intelligence and with hostile feelings to both parents, especially against the father. The usual picture which emerges is that of a drunken and tyrannous father who meets his wife's reproaches with violence to her and the family. The home is a place to avoid and the temptation to get pleasure and adventure elsewhere is strong. It is natural enough that the father should be detested in these circumstances, but less obvious why there should be dislike of the mother too, in some cases. The explanation seems to be that she may give up trying and become irritable towards her children, since they bind her to an unhappy union. An attempt was made to treat parental relationships statistically, but the categories chosen were not adequately defined in advance, and the only significant factors which have emerged out of an otherwise blurred picture of general ineffectiveness are those of hostility to one or other parent.

Hostility to the father is the more common, but seems to have less serious results—the only clear association is with the drinking habit and with paternal alcoholism. Hostility to the mother is a more serious affair since it implies a sense of rejection and injustice which goes far deeper; it is rarely seen in a pure form; usually it is seen as a mixed feeling of love and hate which is all the more disturbing in that no clear-cut issue is found. Occasionally this feeling will find expression in matricide, though it is more often the wife or sweetheart (to whom the ambivalence is transferred) who is the victim. The chief association is with psychopathy (43 per cent. against an average of 24 per cent.). The other associations of mother ambivalence are an early entry into crime (45 per cent. before the age of twenty-one as against the average of 28 per cent.), somewhat greater instability, more

adverse homes and more serious crimes with offences against the person, robbery, and heterosexual offences somewhat pronounced. There is also a high incidence of sibling jealousy; jealousy and easily injured feelings are characteristics of men with this particular background. The association with recidivism is neutral; instability and more serious crime, rather than more numerous offences, seem to be the consequences.

Hostility to parents is not the most general factor of the early home; parental indulgence and weak handling are more frequent; the father leaves it all to his wife and she may nag and reproach, but does nothing effective. It would be interesting to know why these fathers stand aside so much; possibly they have to do so for the sake of domestic peace. Whatever the reason, it seems to be a bad thing to do and the swing away from Victorianism may have gone too far. In later life the over-indulged child expects too much for too little; he finds work dull and discipline onerous and unfair. Once this idea of unfairness creeps in, whether because of hostility to parents or because of too indulgent home standards, the further idea can easily develop that crime is a reasonable reaction to frustration. The whole matter of parental relationships is fundamental to the understanding of criminality, but it requires more careful and detailed study than we have been able to give it in this wide survey.

Sibling jealousy is a factor of considerable importance, greater, probably, than the figures show (24 per cent.). The older child who has been displaced, and the younger or mentally inferior child who cannot compete, is often the only offender in a respectable family and he becomes so because of a sense of unfairness. The child is good in order to gain approval, and if goodness does not get him what he wants he will usually draw attention to himself in other ways, of which theft may be one. In this way it is easy to become the family black sheep and to feel that a dog who has a bad name might as well deserve it. However, sibling jealousy does not move with recidivism. It is associated mainly with inferior intelligence, instability, psychopathy, neurosis and hostility to parents, and turns up mainly in the doubtful column of the recidivist assessment and the middle column of the criminal record as the other factors of instability tend to do.

The only children were picked out as a contrast. The deviations from the average were: better intelligence, better home conditions, a particular weakness for fraud and forgery, less parent hostility, and better work and school records; there were also a higher number of middle-class prisoners involved. Perhaps the leading characteristics of the only children were that they did not expect anyone to be very hard on them and that they showed a special ability to deceive themselves as to the probable consequence of their actions. They had, however, taken special care of themselves

in regard to venereal disease; only 5 per cent. had been so affected as against the average of 16 per cent.

Health (*Table IV*, *Section* 11)

Only 8 per cent. of the total were fit for less than full labour. Physical inferiority moves against recidivism, largely because the less able men were usually older men, so that the age factor came in. They were specially prone to homosexual offences, or to fraud and forgery, and were particularly liable to deny guilt, probably because of the close association with these two offences. They also had much better work records, so that sub-health, with consequent economic difficulties, was not the reason for their offences. Stability and the mental factors were normal.

A different picture is given by those who were considered delicate as children. Only 20 per cent. of these were down-graded for prison employment, so that usually the physical weakness has not persisted. The main result seems to be instability. Forty-five per cent. were so graded against an average of 30 per cent.; 31 per cent. had a history of psychiatric treatment as against an average of 18 per cent. Most of them were rated as of inadequate or hysteroid personality and there was some excess of father hostility and mother indulgence, together with an excess of unsatisfactory school records. The picture is that of over-protection by the mother and they are apt to be very dependent people.

Venereal disease history is taken as a routine and presumably there is some understatement. The general incidence is 16 per cent. There is no special link with any other factor except drink and military service, associations which are easily understood.

Mental Condition (*Table IV*, *Section* 12, *and Table VI*)

The incidence of subnormal intelligence, as measured by Raven's Matrices (S.G. 4 and 5), is high and has a curious distribution in Table IV, being highest in both middle columns. In the assessment column this might be explained by supposing that subnormality introduced an element of doubt into prognosis, but this would not explain the excess in the intermediate column of the criminal record factor. Presumably what happens is that the man of subnormal intelligence does not understand warnings such as probation, but can learn from imprisonment. Certainly it is little use talking to these dull men except in the simplest and most concrete terms. To offset their intellectual handicap they have the advantage of taking fairly easily to a routine and it may be that prison helps them to get set towards work on release. The main positive associations are with subculture, drink and unsatisfactory school and work records.

Instability was noted in two grades and most cases were in the mild grade. In the assessment columns it runs with recidivism but in the criminal record columns it is highest in the middle column; it may be, therefore, that the assessment makes too much of instability. Another marked association is, as one would expect, with a positive history of mental disorder (49 per cent. against the average of 18 per cent.). Much less marked factors were a tendency to crimes of violence and a somewhat inferior work record. A history of mental disorder (psychiatric treatment of some kind as an in or out patient) was found in 18 per cent. and this factor moves moderately with recidivism. The chief other association (apart from instability and the various mental abnormalities) was with military failure, a poor work record and with delicate health in childhood. Only 25 per cent. were rated as psychiatrically normal at reception, so that it does not seem that there is such a ramp in acquiring a mental history as is sometimes suggested.

Neurosis, as seen in prison, consists largely of somatized anxiety and comes out mainly in fear of disease and in exaggerated reaction to simple ailments. It is one of the things which makes prison medical practice so difficult; it takes a good deal of time to follow-up the implications of a headache, or of digestive symptoms, which may well be due entirely to emotional tension.

Psychopathy is a vague term but we have no other to distinguish those unstable men who are peculiarly liable to frustration reactions of an attention-getting sort, such as temper tantrums, childish behaviour and parade of instability. The neurotic is trying to solve his conflict, useless though his efforts may be. The psychopath is often happy enough so long as he is not thwarted; he then fires off his attack just as a wilful child might do. These men are really social defectives whose responses are fixed in a childish pattern and it is useless to think of them as adults. Many improve with firm handling over long periods, but progress is usually by recurrent crises from which they emerge with increased self-control if the crisis has been properly handled. Some people give them up too soon because of disappointment as crisis succeeds crisis; certainly they are very annoying, but if their low emotional age is remembered it is easier to be patient.

Neurotics react rather quickly to treatment in prison as a rule, unless external family events are too disturbing.

The main associations of psychopathy and neurosis are set out in Table VI where the population is divided into the normal, the psychopathic, the neurotic, and the dullard (a sub-group of the intellectually inferior).

It will be seen that the psychopaths are younger, and the neurotics older, than the normals, and that psychopaths first take to crime at an early age. The psychopaths are punished more severely, chiefly because

TABLE VI. MENTAL CONDITION

Category	*Normal*	*Psycho-pathic*	*Neurotic*	*Dullard*
Total number	**625**	**85**	**130**	**260**
Under thirty at present conviction	55	73	46	54
Under twenty-one at first conviction	31	57	29	31
Sentence of over two years	53	61	46	50
Wounding, grievous bodily harm and homicide	13	21	11	13
Robbery with violence	6	13	5	6
Unnatural offences	10	7	13	7
Heterosexual offences	14	8	11	21
Breaking and entering	25	28	24	28
Larceny, receiving and theft	17	11	19	17
Fraud and forgery	12	9	16	5
Miscellaneous offences	3	3	1	3
Will probably return to crime	14	47	18	18
Been to prison, Borstal or approved school	27	38	27	25
Unsatisfactory work record	33	62	45	46
Unsatisfactory school record	24	47	24	51
Military failure (of those who served)	47	89	84	58
Drinker	37	37	23	42
Bad companions	42	52	33	40
Married with disharmonious marriages	62	83	63	57
Single	39	46	43	46
Definite adverse or bad home	39	74	44	55
Middle class	3	3	6	—
Subcultural	5	2	5	15
Parental alcoholism	19	17	17	26
Father hostility	30	34	35	30
Mother ambivalence	25	42	23	22
Sibling jealousy	20	40	22	22
Considered delicate as a child	4	3	15	7
Positive mental history	7	31	54	12

(Percentages except where in bold type.)

they tend to violence to the person and to robbery; the neurotics are punished less severely than normal cases because they tend to avoid such crimes. The prognosis given to psychopaths is very much worse, and more of them have, in fact, already been confined in penal establishments of some kind.

Both neurotics and psychopaths have inferior work records, but the school records of the neurotics are normal whilst those of the psychopaths are bad (twice as bad as normal), evidence that the psychopathy has been

present since childhood; the neurotic may go back to childishness, but the psychopath has never left it.

Both neurotics and psychopaths are military liabilities, showing nearly twice as many failures as the normals, but the psychopaths have been predominantly insubordinate whilst the neurotics have been inadequate. The habits of the neurotics, as shown in drink and companionship, are better than normal—evidence of their relatively good moral sense—whilst those of the psychopaths are worse—evidence of their poor moral sense or, rather, of their erratic moral sense. Neurotics have only the average amount of marital disharmony behind them; the psychopaths have very much more and they must be difficult indeed as husbands.

As one would expect, the psychopaths come from early homes which are very markedly worse than the average so far as maladjustment goes—nearly twice as bad as in the case of the normals. The excess in the case of the neurotics is much smaller. The neurotics have an excess of the small middle-class contingent, whilst subculture is the excess of the dullards. Hostility to the father is in slight excess in both neurosis and psychopathy, but ambivalence to the mother is very outstanding with the psychopaths—another instance of the depth and early incidence of the psychopathic imbalance. Sibling jealousy follows ambivalence to the mother quite closely and is highly associated with it.

The neurotics have a great excess of childhood invalidity, and doubtless the experience of special care and protection as a child is one determinant of the tendency to return to illness when under stress in later years. This factor is absent in the psychopaths. A positive history of mental disorder in great excess is naturally found in both psychopathy and neurosis, especially in the latter since neurotics are recognized as sick people, whereas it is more usual to think of the psychopaths as wicked and ripe for punishment; rather it is that they are ripe for management in a way appropriate to their low emotional age.

So far as recidivism goes, neurosis is a neutral factor and psychopathy a sinister one, which is perfectly understandable if one realizes that crime is immaturity, and that the psychopath is many years behind in emotional development, whilst the neurotic is merely regressive and can often be brought back to maturity. Although the psychopaths are only 8 per cent. of the population they are apt to cause more trouble than all the rest put together, especially in recidivist prisons, and a sigh of relief will go up from the discipline side of the prison service if, and when, it becomes possible to collect them for treatment, though the problem of handling a psychopathic population is likely to be a difficult one. Emotionally they are young and ill-conditioned children; mentally and physically they have the strength and

cunning of adults; it is small wonder that nobody wants to have them. Yet they, great though their sins may be, have suffered much when they were young and helpless, and it is quite insufficient to dismiss them with punishment alone.

PERSONALITY (TABLE VII)

An attempt was made to grade the prisoners in terms of personality but, owing to the lack of well established classifications, it was not very

TABLE VII. PERSONALITY

Category	*Inadequate*	*Schizoid*	*Hysteroid*	*Aggressive*	*Various*
Total number	**560**	**66**	**79**	**73**	**322**
Percentage of total (1,100)	51	6	8	6	29
Under thirty at present conviction	50	62	58	74	59
Under twenty-one at first conviction	28	39	32	41	38
Subnormal intelligence	46	38	37	48	42
Been to prison, Borstal or approved school	26	18	25	30	33
Likely to return to crime	12	8	21	38	28
Sentence over two years	51	71	42	57	52
Wounding, grevious bodily harm and homicide	14	28	6	35	7
Robbery with violence	3	4	5	12	13
Unnatural offences	13	14	6	1	5
Heterosexual offences	19	8	14	13	5
Fraud and forgery	11	5	21	3	13
Bad companions	36	21	30	60	51
Unsatisfactory work record	36	43	37	49	45
Unsatisfactory school record	29	35	28	47	36
Military failure	54	57	68	75	56
Denial or partial denial of guilt	17	12	26	15	14
Single	38	61	31	44	46
Bad home rating	41	51	47	67	49
Mental history	18	27	60	15	8
Unstable	32	62	78	30	7
Delicate as a child	8	6	15	3	2
Drinker	29	15	36	58	49
Disharmonious marriage	71	76	52	61	55

(Percentages except where in bold type.)

successful. There is a large ' inadequate ' group comprising half the population and this term represents fairly well their rather vague and ineffective personality. The only other large group has to be labelled ' various '; it is made up largely of unscrupulous men of fairly mature character who have faced the risks involved in crime and resolved to take them, but a number of poorly classified types have been put with them. The three small distinctive groups which have emerged are the schizoids, the hysteroids and the aggressives. The schizoids include a small number of cases of arrested non-certifiable types of schizophrenia, of whom there are always a number in prison; in less marked cases, the main criterion has been a shut-in personality with shallow emotional responses. The hysteroids might be better labelled histrionics because they go to the opposite extreme of display. The aggressives are those who habitually try to force their way through difficulties by aggression.

The aggressives are the youngest group, start crime earlier, and have the worst record and the worst prognosis. The schizoids are the next youngest group; this group contains a fair number whose present conviction was before the age of twenty-one and who were promptly sent to prison because of the serious nature of their offence. For this reason their previous record is not bad and their prognosis is good. This is rather a surprise, but schizoids often do quite well in prison, provided they are not badly maladjusted to begin with. The inadequates come later to prison and have a fair prognosis.

The schizoids have the longest sentences because of their addiction to crimes of violence of a very serious nature, including a number of cases of murder. Aggressives are next in this respect for the same reason, but their offences are usually not so serious. The hysteroids come off lightest because they tend to avoid violence and concentrate more on fraud. Unnatural offences are associated particularly with the inadequates and the schizoids.

The aggressives have the highest incidence of bad companionship and the schizoids the least, as one would expect from their rather solitary habits. Work and school records do not show anything very strongly except the consistently bad record of the aggressives, who have sought trouble all their lives. The aggressives have also very bad military records; they fight only for themselves. The military record of the hysteroids is also poor because of their marked instability. The hysteroids specialize in the denial of guilt; the acceptance of fiction comes easily to them. The schizoids tend not to bother about denials; they do not bother to marry either, and most of them are single.

The early home rating is worst in the aggressives, and this probably shows whence they derived their aggressiveness. The hysteroids have by far the most marked mental history; they are not likely to miss drawing

attention to themselves, and they do this when they come to prison also, as the high instability rating shows; the relatively large number regarded as delicate in childhood gives a hint whence their tendency to seek sympathy springs. The aggressives are the great drinkers, but the schizoids, when they marry, have the greatest disasters in marriage, followed closely by the inadequates, who are apt to expect mothering in marriage rather than a partnership, and who resent disappointment when it occurs.

DISCUSSION AND SUMMARY

Immaturity and the Origin of Criminality

The immaturity of the criminal has been stressed at several points in the commentary on the survey, but it is far easier to recognize this by day-to-day contact than to demonstrate it statistically. The main evidence is that 51 per cent. were classified as inadequate and another 20 per cent. as schizoid, hysteroid or aggressive. These are all immature types of personality and give a total of 71 per cent. who are immature. The remainder were very various, but mostly unscrupulous men who had adapted themselves systematically to inferior standards of honesty and so had matured in their own undesirable way. The other relevant evidence is that the incidence of crime diminishes with age and that confirmed criminals tend to start young.

The question presents itself: if criminality and immaturity are so closely associated, may they not be much the same thing? We know that young children can be seen, in any not too tidy nursery, assaulting each other, taking the belongings of others, and even engaging in sexual exploration, in a way which would be criminal in adults. No sensible person worries about these things because he knows that it is a normal phase of development which will disappear with training. May it not be that criminality is merely the persistence or reappearance of this nursery stage of development, which becomes ugly and dangerous simply because of the greater strength and sophistication of the adult? After all, it is natural enough to want to have what one desires as quickly and as simply as possible, and it takes training to regard a more devious proceeding as proper. We know, too, that some kinds of minor criminality are frequent enough amongst quite ordinary people. May it not be, therefore, that criminality is the ' natural ' condition of man and that we are all latent criminals, proof against ordinary temptations only because we have been taught to wait for what we want and to abhor the direct methods of the criminal?

If this be true, it will explain much; it will explain not only the immaturity of the criminal and the long latency before some criminals offend; it will

also explain the popular abhorrence of the criminal, since he stands for tendencies which we abhor in ourselves.

Again and again one notes how the reaction of the criminal derives from his earliest frustrations; it re-enacts them because he has never solved the original frustration situation, which therefore calls forth the original immature feelings and the original immature responses. In the rejection situations which so often lead to violence this is particularly true. The rejecting wife who is attacked stands for the over-prized mother who rejected; it has all happened before, except for the crime itself.

If all this be true, as I believe it to be, then the basis of crime is not just simply criminality. There must be added factors to explain persistence or reactivation, and it is these which we must seek.

The Influence of Genetic Factors

It was, at one time, fashionable to attribute criminality to genetic factors; the criminal, it was said, was born not made. This theory is now discredited; it went far beyond the evidence and, in any case, the probability is that we are all born potential criminals; the real problem seems to be why some of us manifest criminality in an active form, and others not.

In this regard it is likely that inferior intelligence and an unstable constitution will be detrimental to proper social development, though not insuperably so by any means. It is therefore relevant to note that 45 per cent. of the Wakefield population were of inferior intelligence and 30 per cent. unstable. Coming to more definite classifications, 23 per cent. were rated as dullards (after excluding the minor degrees of subnormality), 18 per cent. had a positive mental history, 8 per cent. were psychopaths and 12 per cent. neurotics. Taking of these only the dullards and the psychopaths as likely genetic products, 31 per cent., or nearly one-third of the whole, are persons who may be handicapped by genetic inferiority. We can go no further than that.

The Influence of the Early Home

If crime is the persistence or reappearance of immature responses, it is obvious that the nature of the early training will need careful inspection. We find that 46 per cent. of all cases come from homes in which they were either indulgently or ineffectively trained, or where acute hostility to parents or siblings was allowed to develop. These 46 per cent. are all we can be sure of at this distance in time, but, taken the other way round, we only feel sure that 4 per cent. of the homes were of a really good standard, from the point of view of training, as against 76 per cent. of such homes in the background of the best of the officer candidates. These large differences

must be significant, whatever the defects of our methods, so that it seems just to point to the early home as the prime source of the lack of self-control, or of the sensitization to frustration, which leads to the appearance of crime.

It is true that often only one child of several is picked out for crime, but it is a fallacy to suppose that any two children in a family ever get the same training. Mental or physical inferiority, place in family, special favour or dislike from parents or siblings, and the general vicissitudes of the family fortunes, all go to make great differences in the way any particular child fits in. And if he does not fit, or if he fits so closely that he never wants to leave a position of favour, a maladjustment is started which may well terminate in crime, since a balanced relationship with a group is of the essence of social maturity.

The Influence of Social Factors

However, it does not follow that errors in home training are necessarily fatal; there is much room for recovery; of the whole group of officer candidates, men specially selected for their integrity, 7 per cent. had recovered from a definitely adverse home, and only for 52 per cent. had it been plain sailing. There is much that can be done to retrieve the position, if it is not too bad, and if there is someone to do it; all too often there is no such person and deterioration is unchecked. How much so has been shown by the high incidence of failure at school, at work, at marriage and in the fighting services. Failure leads on to failure because of the frustration and loss of training involved; the potential criminal falls more and more behind until he is either solitary or a frequenter of bad companions. In the one case he broods, in the other he imitates; either road leads easily to crime.

Regarding economic difficulties we have little evidence to offer. Certainly there is no economic need (except that which is self-induced) immediately behind the offenders as we see them to-day, though this was not always so. A certain amount of economic need did affect their early homes, though most of our cases come from homes which were not really indigent. Probably we understate this factor since the products of really depressed homes, if they enter crime, are likely to acquire a criminal record so quickly as to be disqualified for Wakefield.

To put it briefly, we can say that social factors may either retrieve or consolidate early faults in training and that the sinister factors are those which lead to social failure, in any direction, and so increase frustration.

Recidivism

Recidivism is an important study because here we can see the consolidation of criminality going on before our eyes. Since over 80 per cent. of

first offenders offend no more, it would seem that the crisis of exposure is enough for most men. Their self-control increases, or their sensitization to some particular frustration situation disappears in the general upheaval. In the case of the recidivist, the reaction is perverse or too small to be effective. Either he cares little, or else he takes shame and punishment as an injury to be resented. In either case he accepts his position as a manifest criminal and models his life accordingly. There are compensations in being inhibition-free in that it makes life much simpler while it lasts; but it is never satisfactory in the long run, and most recidivists become mature and ultimately give up crime; but they will have done a lot of damage in the meantime and will have initiated many others into their nefarious trade.

The conditions which favour recidivism have been emphasized throughout the report and will not be recapitulated here, except to point out that they are those which betoken the existence of well-established adverse habits before reaching Wakefield.

The Incidence of Psychiatric Conditions

There are 12 per cent. of neurotics and 8 per cent. of psychopaths, making 20 per cent. in all, nearly 12 per cent. of which have a history of previous psychiatric treatment; the dullards (23 per cent.) can hardly be considered as psychiatric problems except in so far as they may be unstable. Add to this the fact that all cases have to be examined if those suitable for treatment are to be picked out, and it becomes evident that there is a fair amount of work for medical men in prison; but it must be said that most of the neurotics are somatic cases who present themselves with physical symptoms and that most of the psychopaths require disciplinary handling, as they do anywhere, so that the field is very different to the usual psychiatric situation and it takes some time to adjust to it. It is useless to try to do so unless a firm grasp is kept on general medicine and due respect paid to disciplinary requirements.

The Treatment of Crime

We have no figures regarding the results of the treatment of crime other than the gross recovery rate at Wakefield (88 per cent.), which shows that exposure and punishment, together with ordinary training, are not ineffectual. It is implicit in all that has been said, however, that exposure and punishment, though necessary, are not enough, particularly in cases where frustration is evident. A carefully planned attempt to give insight is necessary and will do good service in some cases. But the emphasis has to be on day-to-day management. By being put in prison, the person has been reduced again

to childhood impotence and his old difficulties come out for better handling. The trouble is that, with large groups, a proper family-like organization is impossible, and institutionalization, rather than working through old difficulties, may result. It is a problem of means. It would be very expensive to treat prisoners in small groups, as at Borstal, and the public will have to decide whether they can afford it; or perhaps we may say, to decide whether they can afford not to afford it.

The Prevention of Crime

The focal point in the prevention of crime is evidently the home and the key people are the parents; the need is for better homes and better management; all the genetic and social factors are secondary to this. The trouble is that in the great centres of population, whence the great majority of prisoners come, the individual is lost in the crowd, and this decrease in inter-personal and communal relationships counter-balances the great social advances which have been made in recent years. Often enough nobody knows and nobody cares that things are going wrong, until they are so wrong as to attract the attention of some official. It is not so in small communities; just as the individual person needs his family group, so the family unit needs its secondary group, small enough to embrace and sustain it.

Research

The great lesson of this research has been the need to have a satisfactory clinical classification of criminals so that they can be put like with like and their backgrounds studied as a group. Legal, administrative and psychiatric classifications will not do; they have been contrived for other purposes, for which they are fit enough, but clinical criminology needs its own classifications and its own discipline before it can set its house in order. At the moment the choice is between large unwieldy groupings or complete atomization into individual cases; both are unsatisfactory for the systematization of knowledge and it is this field of clinical classification that the most useful progress can now be made.

When a manual of clinical criminology can be written akin to manuals of clinical medicine, then, at last, we shall be able to feel that the future is assured.

CLASSIFICATION, ALLOCATION AND PREDICTION TABLES

By GEORGE BENSON (LONDON)

With the development of the idea of reformation as a primary aim of our penal system, the old belief in uniformity has completely vanished, and differentiation and specialization of institutions and methods of treatment have developed apace. Apart from the residue of local prisons practically every institution in the hands of the Prison Commissioners has become more or less specialized. What, however, has failed to develop *pari passu* is any adequate system of classification and allocation to serve these specialized institutions. Except where classification aims merely at administrative simplicity the methods adopted are undoubtedly painstaking, but they are neither scientific nor objective, for they ultimately depend on the intuition of the allocator. As there is no method of checking the accuracy of these intuitive judgments it is quite impossible to know whether they are satisfactory or not.

Where the purpose of allocation is the selection of delinquents likely to respond to a given institution it must obviously depend on some form of classification. For example, men sent to Wakefield Training Prison should belong to the class which may be tautologically defined as ' the class likely to respond to Wakefield Training Prison '. But this immediately raises such questions as whether there is such a class, and if so what are its characteristics; how can they be recognized and defined with the precision necessary for practical application; and finally, is there a method of checking the validity of the classification?

All this may seem to be no more than a statement of the obvious. But, in fact, it implies an approach to classification and allocation entirely different from the one at present employed. Moreover, to answer the questions would require prolonged research of a type not yet undertaken in this country.

Fortunately the technique of this research has already been worked out in America by Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck. Though not concerned with the problems of allocation, their work resulted in the development of a system of classification which is unsurpassed. At the commencement of their research into penal matters they asked themselves three questions. What kind of persons go to prison? What happens to them afterwards? Is it possible to find any quantitative and measurable relationship between the pre-sentence background and post-sentence conduct? In a long and painstaking investigation they collected the data necessary to answer their

first two questions. This was then submitted to rigorous statistical analysis. The result showed that there was a strong correlation between pre- and post-sentence conduct and, what was of outstanding importance, that it was capable of precise measurement.

The raw material for their original research was 510 men due to leave Massachusetts Reformatory in 1921 and 1922. In assembling the background data information was obtained relating specifically to fifty different factors, and over 500 dossiers were built up, which were not only very full but also comparable. For the most part this data was factual, and the only subjective assessment included related to the presence or absence of mental abnormality. The relationship of each of these fifty factors was measured to the post-sentence conduct of *the group as a whole*. For some factors the correlation proved to be negligible. Six however were found to be of prime importance.

The next step was to use these six factors as a basis of classification. As their quantitive relationship to the delinquency of the group as a whole was known, it was possible to give each factor an objective weighting. The method of weighting was of great importance, for it enabled classification to be made on a precise statistical basis. No attempt was made to embody such problematical elements as assessment of character. By a purely statistical method based on the weighting of the six factors, the men were divided into four classes and the post-sentence conduct of each class was then tabulated. The results showed that Class A gave 75 per cent. of successes; Class B gave 43·6 per cent.; Class C gave 26·2 per cent.; and Class D gave 5·7 per cent. Clearly the method of classification was significant.

An assumption was then made that, if criminals subsequently sent to Massachusetts Reformatory were classified on a similar basis, their post-sentence conduct would be similar to that of the class to which they belonged. Thus if a man belonged to Class A, the probability that he would not offend again was 75 per cent., and conversely, that if he belonged to Class D the probability of success was only 5·7 per cent. In other words, it was assumed that the table showing the post-sentence conduct of the classes into which the 500 men had been divided could be used as a ' Prediction Table '. It is curious how adverse is the common reaction to the idea that it is possible to predict the probable result of a sentence. Yet basically it is nothing more than the application to penology of the universally accepted principle that the experience of the past can guide us in the future. The assumption of the Gluecks was that if we systematized and measured past experience we could obtain more precise knowledge of the future.

The validity of this assumption is of very great importance. If it were in reality possible to assess a delinquent's probable reaction to a proposed sentence in measurable terms, not only would the courts have at their disposal

a guide of immense value in the choice of sentences, but what is of equal importance, it would also provide penal administrators with an instrument of extreme flexibility for investigating the large number of problems with which they are faced. It would give a reliable method of classification, and thus provide a system of allocation based upon precise measurement of objective fact and independent of subjective and intuitive judgments.

It is not without humour that research into the behaviour of criminals would throw much light on the activities of the Prison Commissioners themselves. During the past fifty years the Commissioners have revolutionized prison conditions. On grounds of humanity they have been amply justified. But neither they nor anyone else can measure the results. Every change, every reform has been a step in the dark and its consequences are quite unknown. So complete is our ignorance of our penal system that we are still unable to say whether it is better to send adolescent delinquents to eighteen months in Borstal or to three months in prison. We possess no means of comparing the relative efficacy of sentences or institutions because we have no method of classifying prisoners which will sort them into homogeneous and significant classes.

It is here that the work of the Gluecks can give important help, for a reliable prediction table would provide a frame of reference. Once the reaction of a defined class to any institution or form of penal treatment had been measured, the relative advantages or disadvantages of other institutions or treatments could be discovered by comparison. The results of experiments could be accurately assessed and the Commissioners would have a constant guide as to whether they were working on right lines.

Unfortunately, the Prediction Tables prepared by the Gluecks have not yet been validated conclusively enough to silence the critics and convince sceptics; though recently material has been published which is sufficient to convince those to whom the logical and objective technique appeals. Of course, the actual figures and percentages of the Glueck tables apply only to Massachusetts Reformatory and any real validation would have to be made with reference to that institution.

It has occurred to me that a validation of the basic principle on which prediction rests could be made from material already available in the Reports of the Prison Commissioners. The technique of the Gluecks in the construction of their tables was extremely refined, and, although the best so far devised, it is not the only one which can be used. The validity of the principle itself can be proved by methods far less elaborate.

This principle may be stated in the following general terms: 'If the group reaction of a clearly defined class of delinquents to a given form of penal treatment be measured, this measurement gives the probable reaction

of any other delinquent belonging to that class when subjected to similar treatment.' What is important for practical purposes is that the characteristics of the class should be precisely defined and should be both significant and capable of an accurate measurement.

In Appendix 10 of the Prison Commissioners' Reports a very considerable amount of information is given about the results of a first sentence of imprisonment for fingerprintable offences. The information relates to prisoners received in 1930 and in subsequent years. The prisoners are classified by age and record. Succeeding Annual Reports show the percentage of prisoners in each class who have not returned to prison. Thus we have a record of each class received in every year since 1930. Classification by two factors, age and record, is of course very crude when compared with the elaborate method adopted by the Gluecks, but it is the only method that we can employ in view of the limited material available.

The following somewhat complicated tables give the result of a first sentence of imprisonment on some thousands of persons received into prison in each of the four years 1930–33. The prisoners are divided into six classes according to age and record. The tables show the percentages of those in each class who have *not* returned to prison during each of the five years following the year of reception. If we take the conduct of the prisoners in six classes received in the year 1930 as our prediction table we can compare it with the conduct of the similar classes received in 1931, 1932 and 1933, and thus make a triple test as to how far prediction is a practical possibility.

The first table comprises the class ' without previous proved offences ' in the age group 21–30. Column 1 gives the percentage of those prisoners received in 1930 who did not return to prison during the five succeeding years. Thus, reading down the column we find that at the end of the first year 90 per cent. had not returned. At the end of the second year 86 per cent. had not returned and that by the end of the 5th year 81 per cent. had not returned. These figures may be taken as our prediction of how other persons of this class subsequently sent to prison would react. The three adjoining columns give the details of how persons sent to prison in 1931, 1932 and 1933 actually did react. The five other tables deal similarly with five other classes.

TABLES

Effect of a First Sentence of Imprisonment

Percentage of prisoners not known to have returned to prison after a first sentence of imprisonment for finger-printable offences during the five years subsequent to reception:

Years following Year of Reception	PRISONERS WITHOUT PREVIOUS PROVED OFFENCES											
	Age Group 21–30				*Age Group 31–40*				*Age Group 40 and Over*			
	Year of Reception				*Year of Reception*				*Year of Reception*			
	1930	1931	1932	1933	1930	1931	1932	1933	1930	1931	1932	1933
1st	90	90	89	91	95	96	93	94	96	96	96	97
2nd	86	86	86	87	91	92	89	91	95	94	94	94
3rd	82	86	82	85	86	91	87	89	94	93	93	93
4th	82	84	80	83	86	89	85	88	93	92	92	92
5th	81	83	79	81	84	88	84	87	92	92	91	92

Years following Year of Reception	PRISONERS WITH PREVIOUS PROVED OFFENCES											
	Age Group 21–30				*Age Group 31–40*				*Age Group 40 and Over*			
	Year of Reception				*Year of Reception*				*Year of Reception*			
	1930	1931	1932	1933	1930	1931	1932	1933	1930	1931	1932	1933
1st	84	82	80	83	90	90	86	86	92	91	90	91
2nd	73	76	74	75	85	84	81	81	89	87	87	87
3rd	70	72	69	70	81	80	78	78	87	87	84	86
4th	70	70	67	67	79	77	75	75	85	85	82	83
5th	68	68	65	65	79	74	72	72	84	83	81	82

Examination of the tables brings out two facts very clearly: firstly, that within a given class the post sentence record of prisoners received in different years is remarkably similar, and secondly, that each class has its own pattern of conduct. Thus the tables show beyond cavil the practicability of prediction based on objective classification. They also show that this prediction is extremely accurate, for if we treat the figures relating to 1930 as our prediction table our predictions relating to the three years 1931–33 have an average error of only 1·8 per cent.

Tables based on only two factors and relating to all prisons are, of course, of little practical use. The information they give is too general, because the material of which they are constructed is too general. Nevertheless, they may claim to have fulfilled their purpose, which was the validation of the general principle upon which prediction is based.

NOTES ON THE M'NAGHTEN RULES

By EDWARD GLOVER (London)

> *'. . . to establish a defence on the ground of insanity, it must be clearly proved that at the time of committing the act, the accused was labouring under such a defect of reason, from disease of the mind, as not to know the nature and quality of the act he was doing; or, if he did know it, that he did not know he was doing what is wrong'.*

(1) The M'Naghten Rules, however limited their scope, recognize the *principle* that the state of mind of a convicted criminal offender should be taken into account before determining his disposal.

(2) They are limited in scope to the extent that they are concerned with defence on the ground of 'insanity' and only with such cases of 'insanity' as conform to a legal and therefore in the last resort a social definition of irresponsibility.

(3) This socio-legal limitation of the applicability of the M'Naghten Rules conflicts with modern *scientific* concepts of pathological crime, meaning by pathological crime the commission of offences attributable to mental or physical disorder or both.

* * *

(4) Criminal responsibility is at present assessed by *social standards* of individual behaviour, in particular the assumption that unless an offender is manifestly insane ('it must be *clearly* proved') he is a normal person responsible for his actions.

(5) Even this limited social recognition of criminal irresponsibility is due, not to a general appreciation of the manifestly abnormal nature of certain crimes and not solely to a general concern with the justification of punishment, but mainly, as in the case of capital offences, to the *nature* of the punishments legally inflicted, e.g. capital punishment.

(6) Existing methods of disposal of criminals also constitute a social issue: they are determined by a consensus of *social opinion.*

(7) Criminal responsibility and the disposal of convicted criminals, although to this limited extent correlated in law, are nevertheless problems of an entirely distinct nature. The former is concerned with the *diagnosis* of the state of mind or body of offenders; the latter with their *treatment.*

(8) The diagnosis of states of mind or body requires a prolonged technical (scientific) training and can be assessed with accuracy only when an expert examination is made of the constitutional, individual and social factors

that determine either normal or different varieties and degrees of abnormal behaviour.

(9) The treatment of abnormal states of mind or body likewise calls for expert knowledge.

(10) Although the M'Naghten Rules were originally formulated to meet the special case of responsibility for murder (the penalty for which in this country is death) the issue of criminal responsibility cannot be met by the abolition or further restriction of the death penalty or of any other special form of punishment for any special crime.

(11) The issue of criminal responsibility calls for a *system of judicial rules* applicable to *any* crime.

(12) Despite their limited scope the M'Naghten Rules are expressed with a brevity that is inconsistent with the complication and importance of the problems to which they refer. Policies that should be extended in a judicial code are compressed into a legal formula.

* * *

(13) Rules governing criminal responsibility in democratic countries can be formulated in terms of (*a*) a consensus of *social opinion* as given expression by the legislature; (*b*) a consensus of *scientific opinion* regarding the behaviour of individuals ; or (*c*) a combination of (*a*) and (*b*).

(14) Scientific views regarding individual behaviour involve (*a*) a distinction between normal and abnormal behaviour and (*b*) in the case of criminal behaviour, a further distinction between crime occurring in ' normal ' persons (i.e. persons in whom no abnormality can be detected) and pathological crime due to mental or physical disorder.

(15) Behaviour can (and should) be assessed scientifically, viz., in accordance with the main factors or faculties governing it.

(16) The main factors or faculties governing behaviour are, in order of priority or urgency:

(*a*) The nature of the instincts.

(*b*) The nature of the emotions.

(*c*) The nature of the moral faculties.

(*d*) The reality (social) sense.

(*e*) Reasoning capacity.

(*f*) The degree of intelligence.

(17) The effect of physical health and of environmental conditions (social circumstances) on behaviour is measured by the degree to which they modify any or all of the priority factors or faculties enumerated above.

(18) Where disease of the instincts or the emotions, the moral faculties,

social sense, reason or intelligence exists and can be established *as the cause of any given criminal offence*, the individual in question cannot be regarded as normally responsible.

(19) Whereas the degree of responsibility in normal persons varies widely and is difficult to estimate, the degree or severity of disease or disorder giving rise to states of criminal irresponsibility, although varying from one pathological group to another, can be estimated with relative accuracy.

(20) For this reason the authority of a social consensus of opinion regarding criminal responsibility and disposal should be limited to cases where no abnormality can be established: the authority of a scientific consensus should, for the time being, be limited to cases where disease or disorder can be established (see Appendix).

(21) The existing M'Naghten Rules take cognisance only of a restricted number of the factors or faculties that determine criminal irresponsibility.

(*a*) ' *Defect of reason.*' The *fifth* factor in the priority series given above is placed *first* in the M'Naghten Rules. In this connection no specific mention is made of defects of intelligence.

(*b*) ' *Disease of the mind* ' is placed *second* and is a non-specific category and therefore a source of confusion.

(*c*) ' *To know the nature and quality of the act* ', the *third* factor in the M'Naghten series, refers presumably to the offender's ' reality sense ', both individual and social. Here again no specific reference is made to the factor of intelligence.

(*d*) ' *That he did not know what he was doing was wrong* ' implies a disorder or absence of the moral faculties. It is placed *last* in the M'Naghten series.

(22) *No* specific mention is made in the M'Naghten Rules of disorders of the instincts or of the emotions, or of the intelligence.

(23) The M'Naghten Rules do not distinguish between chronic disorders affecting criminal responsibility and acute conditions such as might give rise to criminal behaviour in persons apparently normal in other respects and at other times. Phases of acute alcoholic intoxication or of morbid jealousy may, for example, be due to underlying disease of the mind in persons apparently normal in other respects and at other times, and may give rise to defects of reason, reality sense and the moral faculties.

(24) By limiting their applicability to the state of mind of the offender ' at the time of committing the act ' the M'Naghten Rules prevent cognisance being taken of anything but manifest and gross abnormality, and thereby ignore those phases of onset of disease of which criminal behaviour may be the only sign; e.g. a schizophrenic case might be apparently normal at the time of the commission of the act, yet develop a manifest acute schizophrenic

attack within a few weeks, in which case there is strong presumptive evidence that his criminal conduct was a sign of the oncoming mental breakdown.

* * *

(25) The M'Naghten Rules not only recognize the *principle* of criminal irresponsibility but implicitly recognize the *authority* of the psychiatrist to diagnose it, and to give evidence as an expert witness bearing on the disposal of the criminal. (' It must be clearly proved.')

(26) Since, however, the status of the psychiatrist is not defined in the Rules and since the empirical psychiatry tacitly recognized in the Rules was the psychiatry of a hundred years ago, and, further, since the social consensus of opinion on the justification and nature of punishment has altered in a hundred years, *the conclusion is inescapable that the M'Naghten Rules require both revision and extension.*

(27) A revised set of rules should be expressed in terms which can be understood by the community at large, by judicial authorities and by criminals.

(28) Such technical expressions as are unavoidable should be precisely defined in an appendix to the rules.

(29) The revised rules should include a preamble indicating and defining clearly not only standards of responsibility but standards of irresponsibility.

(30) They should also indicate, in general, the standards applicable respectively to ' normal ' persons and to persons suffering from diseased or defective processes.

(31) They should further indicate clearly to what extent these standards are based respectively on a social consensus and on a scientific consensus of opinion.

(32) They should *specify in particular* those recognized forms of disease or defect either mental or physical in which criminal responsibility cannot be established; as, for example:

(*a*) *Diseases of the instincts :* Sadistic and other perversions: regressive diseases or disorders such as occur at adolescence or the climacteric (change of life).

(*b*) *Diseases of the emotions:* Manic-depressive insanity.

(*c*) *Diseases of the moral faculty:* Psychopathy and psychotic character.

(*d*) *Diseases of the reality and social sense:* Paranoia, schizophrenia.

(*e*) *Diseases of the reasoning capacity:* The psychoses, psychopathies and certain compulsive or impulsive forms of neurotic disorder.

(*f*) *Diseases or defects of the intelligence:* Mental deficiency.

(*g*) *Organic diseases involving mental defect or disorder:* Epilepsy, encephalitis, general paralysis, psychoses of organic origin.

(*h*) *Diseases presenting any combination of the above features:* Traumatic neuroses and psychoses, drug and alcohol addictions.

(33) The new rules should contain a clause providing that in *all* cases of proven murder the offender *must* be adequately examined and observed by an official specialist panel before sentence, and also, on request being made by the legal representatives of the accused, by an independent panel.

(34) They should contain a further clause sanctioning re-examination by official and independent panels on appeal *after* sentence; also a second re-examination by specialist officers appointed by the Home Secretary between any rejection of appeal and the execution of sentence. In the latter event at least one of the specialists appointed by the Home Secretary should be of independent status, i.e. not an officer of the Crown, police or prison official.

(35) The new rules should define precisely and in accordance with medical standards the status of a psychiatrist and should insist that all psychiatrists on the Appeal Panel should have special experience in the diagnosis and treatment of delinquency.

(36) The new rules should contain a clause whereby they can be invoked also in crimes of a degree lesser than that of murder.

* * *

(37) The view that the M'Naghten Rules could be suitably extended by recognizing ' degrees of responsibility ' may appeal to the social sense and sense of equity of the community; it may indeed be desirable in the case of ' normal ' persons committing criminal offences (as where ' extenuating circumstances ' are taken into account); but it cannot be logically applied to *pathological* offenders and therefore does not satisfy scientific requirements.

(38) Where any given crime can be traced to disease or disorder of the mind or body, the subject is criminally irresponsible however normal he may appear *in other respects and at other times.*

(39) In so far as any individual is normally responsible, his conduct is as a rule non-criminal, or if criminal cannot be attributed to any specific disorder.

(40) A psychiatrist can, however, establish *degrees of disorder* in cases of pathological crime; he might also be able to establish in certain cases of mental disorder that the crime was nevertheless *not* due to the disordered action of the mind; but where the crime is due to mental or physical disorder he cannot establish *degrees of responsibility.*

(41) By establishing *degrees of disorder* in pathological crime (i.e. by

making an accurate diagnosis) the psychiatrist can assist the Court in the matter of scientific disposal; e.g., whether institutional care or out-patient treatment is necessary.

(42) The M'Naghten Rules should therefore include a clause calling for a report not only on the nature of the disorder responsible for any pathological crime but the form of disposal that would be suitable to the needs of the case and at the same time have due regard to the need for public safety.

* * *

(43) Although criminal responsibility and capital punishment are distinct problems, the fact that persons convicted of murder may be executed introduces an element of confusion; rules regarding criminal responsibility are in some cases specially framed because of the existence of capital punishment.

(44) The confusion indicated is due to two sets of factors, one emotional and ethical and the other scientific.

(45) Strong emotional and ethical prejudices exist both in favour of and against the practice of execution for murder.

(46) Owing to the absence of adequate scientific research only provisional scientific opinions can be offered regarding either problem.

(47) The issue of capital punishment is therefore in the first instance an ethical issue; namely, is it a good or an evil practice.

(48) Scientific arguments in favour of and/or against capital punishment do not modify this primary ethical issue; they are relevant only to the possibility of *justifying*, *extenuating or condemning* capital punishment irrespective of whether it is a good or an evil practice.

(49) There is strong presumptive evidence that capital punishment is a superstitious, animistic practice derived from the ancient *lex talionis* and other and more primitive social habits.

(50) There is no reliable scientific evidence that capital punishment for the act of murder has a general deterrent effect.

(51) There is evidence that it has no specific deterrent effect on pathological criminals.

(52) There is no evidence that it is essential in the interests of social security; and there is evidence that some humane and more effective measures of security could be taken.

(53) There is so far, therefore, no reliable scientific evidence to justify or extenuate the practice.

(54) Both ethically and scientifically regarded there can be no justification or extenuation of the practice of executing persons who are either mentally disordered or otherwise not responsible for their criminal acts.

(55) If murder be an evil practice, the habit of judicial execution cannot be exempt from ethical condemnation. The authority of the group over the individual, and in particular the exercise by the group of the *vitæ necisque potestas*, has no inherently virtuous sanction.

APPENDIX

Future Extensions of the M'Naghten Rules

It has been laid down (para. 19) that the degree of responsibility in normal persons is difficult to determine and (para. 20) that the authority of a scientific consensus of opinion should be limited *for the time being* to cases of pathological crime, i.e. where disease or disorder can be established as the cause of the act. Nevertheless (para. 37) it is noted that already the disposal of 'normal' criminals may be modified because of 'extenuating circumstances'. This being the case, it is clear that, as knowledge regarding the behaviour of 'normal' persons increases, some attempt will have to be made to reduce 'extenuating circumstances' to scientific order, i.e. to express them in terms of *endurable or unendurable stress of mind.* When that stage has been reached it will be desirable to extend still further the M'Naghten Rules. In the meantime, it is undesirable to confuse the issue of pathological crime by extending the same rules to non-pathological crime. It is due to the confusion of these issues and the consequent belief that extended M'Naghten Rules would give legal cover to the actions of 'ill-doers' that so much opposition exists to revising and extending the Rules.

The criminal, like the hero, the artist and the reformer, has loosened his ties with society through 'individual action', and like them he has not, by so doing, severed them entirely. He retains his membership, and with it his Super-ego, although the latter gets partly refurbished, partly delapidated. There is an active influence on both sides: society trying to reform the criminal, the criminal occasionally reforming society, without asking or getting credit for it. Crime forms a part of every successive stage of civilization, and, therefore, deserves to be studied as one of its characteristic expressions. It is an incongruous and contradictory, but none the less essential, element of society, like the devils and gargoyles hovering on the roof of every Gothic Cathedral.

HANNS SACHS: 'Masks of Love and Life'.
(Sci-Art Publishers, Cambridge, Mass., 1948.)

SOVIET VIEWS ON WESTERN CRIME AND CRIMINOLOGY

By T. GRYGIER (London)

I

In view of the scarcity of positive information regarding recent developments in criminology in Soviet Russia, it may be useful to examine the Russian approach by an indirect route; namely, through their criticism of Western criminology and their views on the causes of crime in ' capitalist ' countries. This paper represents an attempt to understand the Soviet outlook in the light of some recent articles published in the central journal, *Soviet State and Law*, under the editorship of Mr. A. Y. Vyshinski.[1] There have been three such articles: ' Reactionary studies in anthropology and sociology in America ', by B. S. Nikiforov (1), ' Recent tendencies of reactionary American biocriminology ', also by B. S. Nikiforov (2), and ' Delinquency in capitalist countries during the Second World War ', by A. A. Herzenson (3). Although the third article does not seem to be related to the first two, it provides a missing link which shows that the Soviet approach is much more coherent and meaningful than it appears to be on the surface.

II

According to Nikiforov (1) any understanding of recent developments in Western criminology and criminal law is impossible without a realization of the corresponding changes which have taken place in social background, i.e. the rapid concentration of production, the growing strength of monopolies, the polarization of wealth and poverty, with chronic unemployment and recurring economic crises. In this situation the change in the amount and the form of delinquency ' expresses the intensification of the spontaneous protest of the exploited against the injustices of the capitalist system ' (p. 52). In the light of the growing ' fight against the capitalist exploitation ' there have been some attempts to strengthen ' the arbitrary rule of the police as the tool of the imperialist state ', and at the same time to adopt some phraseology which could make ' the abandonment of the bourgeois-democratic principles ' less conspicuous. Anthropologists and sociologists were to provide ' the pseudo-scientific phraseology in the name of the defence of the vital interests of society ' (p. 52).

Nikiforov summarises the old theory of Lombroso and concludes that

[1] This journal is the official organ of the Institute of Law of the Soviet Academy of Science and of the Institute of Legal Science of the Soviet Ministry of Justice.

the essential elements of that theory, i.e. the concepts of a ' dangerous condition ', of ' criminal types ', of the ' potential criminal ' and of ' measures of social defence ', have been revived in the pseudo-scientific theories of the present century, in particular those of Freud, Kretschmer, Kraepelin and their followers. Even the sociologists, it is maintained, have accepted Lombroso's views by claiming that certain categories of persons, e.g. the vagabond, the unemployed, and the poor, are dangerous to society, and that preventive measures should be applied to them whether they have committed an offence or not. The Freudians accepted the theory of Lombroso by claiming that human behaviour, including criminality, is influenced by unconscious sexual experiences (p. 53).

The most typical protagonist of recent trends in American criminology is, according to Nikiforov, Earnest Albert Hooton (4, 5) and he is quoted extensively as an example of the bio-sociological approach. Thorsten Sellin and Walter C. Reckless are taken as exemplifying the purely sociological approach and the latter is quoted to the effect that ' crime, sociologically speaking, is fundamentally a violation of conduct norms which contain sanctions, no matter whether found in the criminal law of the modern state or merely in the working rules of special groups ' (6). Edwin H. Sutherland's theory (7) that ' crime and not-crime are not very distinct types of behaviour, but constitute a continuum ' is considered very close to that of Reckless and equally reactionary (p. 55). David Abrahamsen (8) is quoted as exemplifying the modern psychiatric approach. Incidentally, all quotations chosen by Nikiforov make Abrahamsen out to be a strict follower of Lombroso: Abrahamsen's critical remarks on Lombroso's theory are omitted. On one occasion he is definitely misquoted in a way which implies his agreement with Lombroso, a matter which is discussed later in this article. In conclusion, Abrahamsen is cited by Nikiforov as a subscriber to Lombroso's theory with all its implications.[2]

The theory of ' multiplicity of causes ' is next criticized by Nikiforov. Its followers are said to be Hooton and Abrahamsen, already quoted as representing the bio-sociological and the psychiatric approach respectively; also Donald R. Taft (9), in particular in his argument that crime is a product of culture. Other quotations in this section come mainly from R. Vambery (10), W. B. Tucker (11) and Hans von Hentig (12). The psycho-analytic concept of the super-ego which, according to the followers of that school,

[2] In case the reader should feel *either* that my exposition of Russian views is biased *or* that the Russians are so unscientific and dishonest that whatever they say about Western criminology is not worth studying and that therefore this article is not worth reading, I trust the subsequent discussion will show that neither of these alternatives is probably true, and that even in his misquotations Nikiforov expresses some characteristic Russian attitudes to the social sciences which deserve close attention and scrutiny.

may be weak or faulty in certain cultures and in the criminal, is criticized by Nikiforov as essentially Lombrosian and reactionary, since its final implication is that certain categories of people are less valuable than others and should be treated accordingly (pp. 57–9).

In conclusion Nikiforov regards present-day American criminology as 'an eclectic mixture of different points of view, underlying assumptions, proofs and arguments' (p. 62). 'This muddle of underlying assumptions and arguments is by itself the best evidence of the unscientific character of all these systems, the viciousness of their essential principles, the inadequacy of bourgeois criminal law, and the unwillingness of the bourgeoisie, conditioned by their class interests, to reveal the real causes of delinquency in the capitalist society' (p. 63). In general, American criminology does not differ from the theories fostered by European anthropologists and sociologists, with the exception of Hooton, who develops them a little further in a more openly Fascist way (p. 63).

III

In his next article (2), Nikiforov explains the existing state of affairs—the development of bio-socio-criminology as 'an eclectic mixture of different points of view and pseudo-scientific theories', the attempts 'to combine Lombroso with Darwin', the investigations into genetic proximity between man and animal, and the theory of multiplicity of factors—as an effort 'to disguise and conceal the fact that the primary and all-embracing cause of delinquency in capitalist society is the capitalist system itself' (p. 51). In that respect 'the American bio-socio-criminology does not go beyond the "achievements" of the reactionary anthropologists and sociologists on the European soil' (p. 51).

Further on Nikiforov devotes whole pages of his article to quotations from Hooton (4, 5) and from Abrahamsen (8). The latter Nikiforov regards as being in essential agreement with Hooton because of his claim that '. . . criminal tendencies are more easily elicited when abnormalities are originally present in the person's make-up' (8, p. 157). Both these writers are criticized by Nikiforov as being theoretically wrong and reactionary, and their evidence is put down to racial discrimination. In that respect von Hentig (12) and T. Sellin (13) are quoted, and it is stressed that 'even such a none too liberal investigator as Professor Sellin' admits the existence of racial discrimination in the American courts (p. 54).

According to Nikiforov all these writers are animated by the same political aim. 'That aim is to prove by hook or by crook—that crime is not the result of social conditions, but a product of biological predetermination; that it is due not to unemployment and poverty but to the biological

defect of some individuals—people of inferior quality; these " bad people " would remain sinners even in paradise ' (p. 58).

The new trend in Western criminology, opposed to the more liberal views of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth century, is based, according to Nikiforov, on the assumed correlation between physical and psychological inferiority. Moreover, it is based on the assumption that our biological inheritance is fixed. This the Soviet scientists reject as ' the reactionary, idealistic theory of development ', and they accept the theory of T. D. Lysenko, which is ' the progressive materialistic theory of development '. Nikiforov quotes Lysenko's theory, given in a lecture at the Lenin Academy of Agricultural Sciences on July 31, 1948, as follows: ' The materialistic theory of development of living organisms is unthinkable without recognition of the necessity of hereditary transmission of individual differences acquired by the organism under certain conditions of its life; it is unthinkable without recognition of the inheritance of acquired characteristics.' To this quotation from Lysenko, Nikiforov adds (p. 59): ' In contrast, the reactionary idealism in biology denies the inheritance of acquired qualities.'

Further on Nikiforov criticizes the view, summarized by N. Cantor (14), that behaviour is ' a configuration of the interplay between objective environment factors and the subjective, constitutional, biological, inherited tendencies ', and the theory, supported by Abrahamsen (8), that crime is the result of the maladjustment of the individual to his environment. In this way the poor and the unemployed ' are cynically accused in the name of the bio-criminological theory of social maladaptation ' and their crimes are taken as proof of their guilt in that they are unable to adjust themselves to the capitalist system (p. 61). The outcome of all these theories is the ' barbaric practice ' of sterilization, developed in the U.S.A., Denmark, Germany, Norway, Finland and other countries.

IV

The article by A. A. Herzenson is in two parts: the first is devoted to criminality in the U.S.A., and the second to that in Great Britain. Both parts contain numerous statistical tables and vivid impressionistic descriptions showing the increase in the rate of delinquency in both these countries, not only during the Second World War, as the title of the article would suggest, but since the beginning of the present century. Herzenson considers that the U.S.A. and Great Britain share the palm of criminality throughout the world, even according to the official statistics (1949, p. 57). These are not regarded by him as complete, however, since the most serious crimes escape them: these are the crimes ' committed by the imperialist bourgeoisie and

its agents in the fields of industry and commerce, and of government (corruption, white terror), crimes against peace and humanity, treacherous crimes of the cosmopolitan bourgeoisie' (1949, p. 58). In addition, in both these countries the detection of crime falls behind: in Great Britain, for instance, in less than one offence in six is the offender detected and convicted (1949, p. 62). The increase in juvenile delinquency in the U.S.A. is estimated by Herzenson as 350 per cent. since Pearl Harbour (1948, p. 80); the increase in general criminality in the U.K. as 400 per cent. during the last thirty-five years (1949, p. 64).

The writer's conclusion (given already at the very beginning of the second part of Herzenson's article and only repeated at the end), is that criminality in the capitalist countries is the direct result of the system of compulsory labour developed by the rich land-owners and other capitalists who monopolize the means of production and hold the workers in a state of complete dependence (1949, p. 57). The increase of criminality reflects the general crisis of capitalism in the twentieth century (p. 64), and cannot be adequately checked by attempts 'to combine mediæval measures of repression—hard labour, senseless work in the prisons, the exploitation of the unpaid work of convicts, flogging, etc.—with the "modern" achievements of fascist repression—castration and sterilization of prisoners, the "invention" which has its dirty ideological basis in various false biological American theories' (p. 65). In this connection due reference is made to the articles by Nikiforov summarized above.

V

The first reaction of the Western reader to the Russian account of Western crime and criminology, and to the content and manner of presentation of the articles summarized above, will probably be that the presentation is (*a*) biased and incomplete, and (*b*) expressed in affective and abusive (i.e. unscientific) language. I shall attempt to analyse both these objections.

The objection to the manner of presentation is the more easily dealt with. It is true that affective expression is avoided by Western scientists; and it is also true that most articles written in an emotional strain in our culture have probably little if any scientific value. It may be said, however, that the scientific character of any contribution derives from the methods of the investigator and the precision of his argument, and not from his unwillingness to display emotions. In Russia scientists do display emotions and mix evaluations with statements of fact, but that is no reason for disregarding their evidence or such logic as exists in their argument.

The incomplete and biased character of the picture of Western crime and criminology presented by Nikiforov and Herzenson appears to be a more

serious matter. In particular, Nikiforov may be accused of serious omissions and of biased selection (in one case even misrepresentation) of quotations from the American literature. He makes, for instance, twenty-five references to Hooton in his footnotes, and even more in the text, but none to the Gluecks, Lunden, Shaw or Teeters. It may be useful to consider the reason for such a strange presentation of the contributions of American criminologists.

One, and the most obvious reason, may be that Nikiforov has had no opportunity to read their books. Even his references to Reckless, Sutherland, Taft and some others are made in a way which suggests that he probably has not read them. All references to, and quotations from, Reckless and Sutherland can be found in a short article by Vambery; all quotations from Hooton's ' Crime and the Man ' in an article by Tucker; even in the case of a short article by Cantor, Nikiforov appears to have studied not the original but Tucker's article in which it is briefly referred to. Whenever Reckless, Sutherland, Cantor, etc., are fully quoted by Vambery and Tucker, they are fully quoted by Nikiforov. When Vambery and Tucker omit some words from their quotations, Nikiforov omits the same words. When they give the numbers of the pages in the books they refer to, Nikiforov gives these page numbers as well, but when Vambery and Tucker fail to give these page numbers, only the page numbers of their own articles are indicated by Nikiforov. Thus the bias in selection may be partly attributed to defective scholarship.

The misquotation of Abrahamsen by Nikiforov is a different matter and cannot be explained simply on grounds of lack of scholarship. It might be interpreted as evidence of lack of integrity, and that would be a serious accusation which I would be very reluctant to make. In my opinion the origins of the misquotation lie deeper, and their understanding would throw some light on the Russian attitude to scientific argument.

First of all let us bring the misquotation to the right proportions. Where Abrahamsen said ' Lombroso stated ', Nikiforov translated ' Lombroso ukazal ' which means ' Lombroso showed ' and implies that Abrahamsen agrees with Lombroso. The exact translation of ' stated ' would be ' zayavil ', which carries no implication of agreement. Had Nikiforov the moral right to introduce an implication which Abrahamsen, judging from the rest of his book, could not have made? To answer this question one must go into the Russian pattern of culture reflected in their accepted modes of expression in scientific matters.

For reasons which cannot be analysed adequately here,[3] the Russians

[3] I have attempted to analyse these in the light of Soviet social structure and Russian method of child-rearing, in an article to be published in the March issue of the *Brit. J. Psychol.* (15). See also ' The People of Great Russia ' by Gorer and Rickman (16), and ' Psychiatric observations in the Arctic ' by the present writer (17).

are very reluctant to take a neutral attitude and use understatement. You must either be right or wrong in Soviet Russia—and you must make your standpoint clear.[4] If you quote somebody else's views you must *at once* pass your own judgment on them; otherwise you will be considered to share them. The Russians are very careful in this respect, and both Nikiforov and Herzenson—in accordance with the usual custom—never summarize the views of Western scientists without saying that they are false; they never present any Western theories without adding the adjective ' reactionary ', ' pseudo-scientific ', etc., or at least putting the word ' theory ' in inverted commas. Abrahamsen failed to follow the Russian custom—he did not say ' Lombroso erroneously stated ', but just ' Lombroso stated '—therefore a Soviet reader would assume his agreement with Lombroso and with the Lombrosian theory, more especially since he admits (8, p. 6) that Lombroso made a ' fundamental contribution ' to criminology. In the same way Freud is taken to be a follower of Lombroso because he refers to the sexual, i.e. biological drives, and to inherited constitution.

In Russia, once you see some value in a theory you accept it, and you must accept it with all its consequences. Otherwise you reject it. To accept a part and disregard the rest is unscientific. From this point of view Nikiforov's opinion that American criminology is eclectic is a grave indictment. If you are eclectic it means that you have no philosophy and no system, and cannot be scientific.[5] You are scientific if you have a coherent philosophy in agreement with the doctrine of Marx, Lenin and Stalin. If you have no coherent philosophy, or if your philosophy is not in accordance with this doctrine, you are wrong and unscientific and no empirical evidence you may adduce will change that fact.

Once this point of view is accepted all the empirical evidence of American and British criminology becomes nonsensical, if not a wilful falsification. Sutherland and Hooton, Abrahamsen and Lombroso, Reckless and Tucker are all in the same camp. Sutherland's devastating critique of Hooton's books proves nothing (and would certainly be rejected by Nikiforov if he had read it), since Sutherland merely argues that Hooton's empirical evidence is inadequate for his conclusions. In this way Sutherland does not reject Hooton's basic assumptions and ' reactionary ' ideology and may be safely put into the same pigeon-hole.

How far the methods of Russian science are theoretical and deductive,

[4] As Gorer (16, p. 232) says, ' you are in the truth or else you are outside it, you " belong " or you don't '. To the Russians ' there cannot be a better example of hypocrisy and cynicism than the English habit of understatement and tendency to regard everything from two points of view. Only one point of view can be " true " and " right ": if you claim otherwise you are a cheat ' (15).

[5] Cf. also ' Aspects of Soviet and American Psychology ', by John McLeish (18).

as opposed to the practical inductive-deductive methods followed in Great Britain and the U.S.A., can be seen in the light of recent developments in the most empirical—as one might think—of all the sciences, i.e. biology.

Nikiforov refers to the lecture by the famous Russian biologist, T. D. Lysenko, which he regards as a guide not only for the agriculturalists whose meeting Lysenko addressed, but for criminologists as well. A verbatim report of this lecture, together with the subsequent discussion, was published in an English translation by The Foreign Languages Publishing House in Moscow in 1949 (19).

Lysenko's views on heredity, being the application of the Marxist theory to the study of genetics, are certainly important in themselves. His definition of heredity as ' the effect of the concentration of the action of environmental conditions assimilated by the organism in a series of preceding generations ' has been accepted by all Soviet scientists including criminologists. The specific manner of approach, both of Lysenko and other Soviet scientists, is, however, even more illuminating.

Lysenko frankly admits that he lacks adequate evidence for support of his theory but he is confident that the Lenin Academy of Agricultural Sciences of the U.S.S.R. of which he is the President will ' tackle this major task ' (19, p. 30). His lecture criticizes ' Weismannism ' and ' Mendelism-Morganism ' as reactionary ideologies rather than as empirical sciences (pp. 15 *ff*), and he even entitles this part of his lecture: ' Two worlds—two ideologies in biology '. His criticism of Darwin is based on ' the classics of Marxism ' which proved that ' Darwin introduced into his theory of evolution reactionary Malthusian ideas ' (p. 12).

After a discussion in which Lysenko was criticized by some biologists, in particular by Zhukovsky, Alikhanian and Polyakov, he made the following statement: ' The question is asked in one of the notes handed to me, What is the attitude of the Central Committee of the Party to my report? I answer: The Central Committee of the Party examined my report and approved it. (*Stormy applause. Ovation. All rise*) ' (Verbatim report, 19, p. 605). Thus the biological problems are settled by the political organs—Zhukovsky and his followers apologize and withdraw. Zhukovsky declares that his critical speech was his ' last speech from an incorrect biological and ideological standpoint ' (p. 618), and promises: ' I will honestly carry out what I proclaim here today ' (p. 619). He says (pp. 619–20): ' Believe me, that I take this step today as a Party member, as a sincere member of our Party—that is honestly. (*Applause.*) '

It is apparent from the foregoing that in Soviet Russia the relationship between the natural and the social sciences has the opposite character to that which prevails in the West. In the West, in particular in Great Britain

and America, we are so impressed by the value of the inductive-deductive, i.e. empirical methods, and by the exactness of experiments in the field of the natural sciences, that we are inclined to use these methods as guidance for new theories. In Russia there is certainly much experimenting, in some fields even more than in the West, but the real guidance for the development of new theories does not come from them. Even in biology new theories are based on deduction from the only accepted political theory, that of Marx, Lenin and Stalin.

What Professor J. Z. Young (20) said about the mixture of certainty and doubt in science, about the attitude of the scientist who ' hardly knows himself what law he is trying to prove ', who ' is continually observing, but his work is a feeling out into the dark, as it were '—all this can be applied to Western scientists only, and even not to all of them. The purely deductive processes do not mix certainty with doubt—once you accept an axiom you proceed from one certainty to another. In Soviet Russia even the electoral system is based on deduction: instead of trying to find out by the great experiment of free elections which government is best for the country, the Russians assume that their present government must be the best in the world, and deduce, quite logically, that everybody must vote for it. There is no uncertainty as to the results of the elections.

In this situation the Russians cannot have any criminology in our sense, i.e. the empirical. They look with contempt at our futile efforts to discover various criminogenic factors, to weigh them and analyse their mutual relationships. They are under no necessity to analyse our social conditions to find out whether there is really a growing ' polarization of wealth and poverty ' in Great Britain at the present moment. They know it all—they deduce it from their interpretation of the Marxist doctrine. And they know that there is one all-embracing criminogenic factor in the West —the weakness of the capitalist system.

REFERENCES

(1) B. S. Nikiforov. ' Reaktsyonnye antropologo-sotsyologicheskye uchenya na amerikanskoy pochve ', *Sovietskoye Gosudarstvo i Pravo*, No. 5, May, 1949, pp. 52–63.

(2) B. S. Nikiforov. ' Noveyshie tendentsii reaktsyonnoy amerikanskoy bio-kriminologii ', *Sovietskoye Gosudarstvo i Pravo*, No. 7, July, 1949, pp. 51–62.

(3) A. A. Herzenson. ' Prestupnost v kapitalisticheskikh stranakh vo vremya vtoroy mirovoy voyny ', *Sovietskoye Gosudarstvo i Pravo*, No. 1, January, 1948, pp. 72–80, and No. 10, October, 1949, pp. 57–65.

(4) E. A. Hooton. ' The American Criminal: An Anthropological Study ', Harvard Univ. Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1939, pp. irreg.

(5) E. A. Hooton. ' Crime and the Man '. Harvard Univ. Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1939, pp. XVI, 403.

(6) W. C. Reckless. 'Criminal Behaviour'. McGraw-Hill Publishing Co. Ltd., New York–London, 1940, pp. XI, 532.
(7) E. H. Sutherland. 'Principles of Criminology'. Lippincott, Chicago–Philadelphia, 1934, pp. VII, 611.
(8) D. Abrahamsen. 'Crime and the Human Mind'. Columbia University Press, New York, 1944, pp. XIV, 244.
(9) D. R. Taft. 'Criminology'. Macmillan, New York, 1942, pp. XII, 708.
(10) R. Vambery. 'Criminology and Behaviourism', *J. Crim. Law & Criminol.*, 1941, Vol. XXXII, pp. 158–165.
(11) W. B. Tucker. 'Is there Evidence of a Physical Basis for Criminal Behaviour?' *J. Crim. Law & Criminol.*, 1940, Vol. XXXI, pp. 427–37.
(12) H. von Hentig. 'The Criminality of the Negro', *J. Crim. Law & Criminol.*, 1940, Vol. XXX, pp. 662–80.
(13) T. Sellin. 'The Negro Criminal: A Statistical Note'. In *The American Negro*, the Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, Vol. CXXXX, Philadelphia, 1928, pp. 52–64.
(14) N. Cantor. 'Recent Tendencies in Criminological Research in Germany', *J. Crim. Law & Criminol.*, 1937, Vol. XXVII, pp. 782–93.
(15) T. Grygier. 'The Psychological Problems of Soviet Russia'. To be published in the March issue, 1951, of the *Brit. J. Psychol.*
(16) G. Gorer and J. Rickman. 'The People of Great Russia: A Psychological Study'. The Cresset Press, London, 1949, p. 236.
(17) T. Grygier. 'Psychiatric Observations in the Arctic', *Brit. J. Psychol.*, 1948, Vol. XXXIX, pp. 84–96.
(18) J. McLeish. 'Aspects of Soviet and American Psychology', *Soviet Studies*, 1950, Vol. I, pp. 343–6.
(19) Lenin Academy of Agricultural Sciences of the U.S.S.R. 'The Situation in Biological Science'. A verbatim report of the proceedings. Session: July 31–August 7, 1948. Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1949, p. 631.
(20) J. Z. Young. 'The Biologist's Approach to Man', *The Listener*, Vol. XLIV, No. 1131, November 2nd, 1950.

The ordinary offences of children are not very dangerous to the structure of society, and we can therefore turn our attention without much risk rather to curing them than suppressing them. And as a general rule the decisions of the elder world are tacitly accepted by the younger as righteous. In cases where the authority who inflicts the punishment, or the law upon which it is inflicted, are explicitly rejected as unjust by the offenders, we cannot hope that punishment will be more than deterrent. But such cases are infrequent, and there is good reason to suppose that they will remain so. For it is a fact which, though often forgotten, cannot well be denied, that children are born young—a fact which has some significance.

John Mc T. Ellis McTaggart: 'Studies in Hegelian Cosmology.'

CURRENT RESEARCH

(*Continued from No.* 3, *p.* 208)

XII. Personality Formation of Delinquent Children

(1) *Name of University Department, Hospital, or other Institution or private person supplying the information:* Mr. Kevin P. Murphy, B.A.

(2) *Subject of Research :* 100 delinquent children, 100 of their non-delinquent sibs., and a group of approximately 40 non-delinquent neurotic children are given a battery of three tests:

(*a*) The Rorschach test; (*b*) a persistence test based on a modification of the Raven Progressive Matrices (1938); and (*c*) a projection test indicating family attitudes. The object is to compare the character formation of the three groups with special reference to their family and general environment. In particular an attempt will be made to discover how far the type of disorder is a product of environmental stress. The results will be examined against the background of an ecological survey of the area from which the cases are drawn.

(3) *Under whose auspices is the research being carried out?:* As a thesis for the degree of M.A. in the University of Manchester. *Supervisors:* Professor T. H. Pear and Dr. Florence E. MacNeill. *Research Worker:* Mr. Murphy.

(4) *Commenced* in July, 1950; likely to be completed in July, 1951.

(5) *Publication:* Nothing so far published.

XIII. Psychotherapy of Juvenile Delinquents

(1) The Institute for the Study and Treatment of Delinquency.

(2) A small group of delinquent boys with hostile, disintegrated or disturbed family background has been examined and treated jointly by a male and a female research worker playing the rôles of ' parent substitutes '. An attempt is being made to investigate the usefulness of this approach to various categories of juvenile delinquents of both sexes who have disturbed relationships with both their parents. Several variants in psychotherapeutic procedure are being tried.

(3) The Institute for the Study and Treatment of Delinquency. *Research workers:* Miss Alice Buck, M.D. (Psych. Med.), Ch.B., and Mr. T. Grygier, Ph.D.

(4) *Commenced* in March, 1950; the first part to be completed by the Spring, 1951.

(5) Nothing so far published.

(6) This investigation was stimulated by the research on leisure pursuits, reported in the first number of this Journal (July, 1950, p. 63), where it was noted that the male investigator acting together with the female psychotherapist created a new dynamic situation which may have important therapeutic consequences for some categories of juvenile delinquents and provides new ground for the exploration of the dynamics of primary group relationships.

REVIEWS

FESTSKRIFT TILLÄGNAD KARL SCHLYTER. Den 21 December, 1949. (Stockholm: Isaac Marcus Boktryckeri-Aktiebolag. 1949. Pp. 413.)

It is mainly to the persistent efforts of two outstanding penologists that Sweden owes her present place in the forefront of the modern penal reform movement: to Olaf Kinberg, the psychiatrist, and to Karl Schlyter, the lawyer, former Minister of Justice, Appeal Court President and Chairman of Penal Reform Commissions. The present volume, written in honour of Dr. Schlyter's seventieth birthday and containing his picture and an impressive bibliography of seventeen pages of his publications between 1907 and 1949, is a fitting tribute to his work and personality. Although, as is only natural, his colleagues from the four Scandinavian countries have contributed almost six-sevenths of the whole, there are also six interesting papers written in French, English and German, to some of which attention may be drawn in this review.

M. Marc Ancel, Conseiller à la Cour d'Appel de Paris and Secrétaire Général de l'Institut de Droit Comparé de l'Université de Paris, in a short but brilliant paper on '*l'Evolution de la Notion de Défense sociale*' sketches the three stages which, in his view, the conception of social defence as opposed to that of punishment has undergone since the end of the last century. The first stage, lasting until 1914, was dominated mainly by the academic struggle between the idea of punishment in accordance with individual responsibility, as advocated by the Classical School of Penology, and the new conception of social dangerousness. The second stage, filling the period between the two world wars, was characterized by legislative efforts to put the idea of social defence against dangerous criminals regardless of their individual responsibility into practice by introducing a system of '*mesures de sûreté*'. The latter, however, did not entirely replace punishment, and a dualistic and eclectic system of 'legislative experimentation and pragmatic empirism', favouring a combination of both measures, was brought into existence instead of the homogeneous, purely dogmatic schemes of the first period. The third stage, beginning in 1939 and not yet concluded, stresses, as a reaction against the experiences made under totalitarian régimes, more than the second the need for the preservation of human rights and liberties. Whereas it had been the main object of the second phase to uphold the interests of Society by restraining the individual, it is our present-day aim to reconcile both. We are not as a matter of principle opposed to punishment or to its combination with non-penal measures of social defence, but we do insist that punishment, where it is needed, should be reformative. As a consequence, a strange change of public attitude has taken place towards the ideas of the Modern School of Penology: whereas, during the second phase, this school used to be criticized for neglecting the interests of the individual, it is now often blamed for endangering the safety of society by emasculating punishment.

While fully admiring the brilliance and logic of M. Marc Ancel's exposition, some of us who have gone through most of the period to which he refers may have the feeling that the contrasts between the characteristic features of the first and second phases may be slightly overdrawn. On the other hand, it is certainly

true that, fortunately, a stage has now been reached where most of the dogmatic obstacles of the pre-1939 period have had to give way under the pressure of practical experience and common sense. No doubt there have been and will be differences in this respect between one country and another: attention has already been drawn in our Editorial to certain peculiar features of English penal reform.

M. Paul Cornil, Secrétaire Général du Ministère de la Justice, Professeur à l'Université libre de Bruxelles, contributes some equally valuable reflections on the development of the various aspects of '*Individualisation pénitentiaire*' since the publication of Saleilles's famous book over fifty years ago. He discusses the inevitable limitations of individualization of treatment with regard to the general standard of living in penal institutions where, he thinks, individualization of treatment is out of place, and an average standard, '*un niveau moyen*', has to be the object of prison administration. Rightly, he thinks, there is no risk in conceding this *niveau moyen* to the under-privileged (no 'less eligibility'): it will rather produce in him '*une noble ambition*', the desire to rise socially. Regarding the extent to which individual treatment can be achieved in vocational and moral education of prisoners, M. Cornil is equally sceptical, and although he admits the advantages which the small institution of fifty inmates has over that of a thousand the difference is, he thinks, only one of degree.

Mr. *L. W. Fox*, the Chairman of the Prison Commission for England and Wales, gives a brief but illuminating survey of the provisions of the Criminal Justice Act, 1948, as far as they affect the prison system, followed by a comparison between that Act and the Swedish Prison Act of 1945 which shows a considerable volume of agreement on fundamental principles. There are, however, also some interesting differences. Whereas the English Act provides only the framework, its Swedish counterpart regulates also the details of prison administration; whereas in Sweden the open prison is already regarded as the rule, the English Act leaves it to the Prison Commission to determine how far it should be used.

Professor *Donnedieu de Vabres's* essay will be of a special interest to the criminal lawyer. He writes as the President of a Reform Commission which has recently published the draft project of a new French Code of Criminal Procedure where it is proposed to substitute the *procureur* for that old traditional French institution, the *juge d'instruction*, and to prevent abuses by providing a judge of superior status, the *juge de l'instruction*, to check the activities of the *procureur*. From Professor de Vabres's detailed account it appears that these proposals have met with strong opposition.

Professor *Thorsten Sellin* offers a detailed analysis of the formidable difficulties in establishing a working system of national Criminal Statistics in U.S.A., and Dr. *Gerhard Simson* describes the influence which the work of Franz von Liszt, the great German criminal lawyer and criminologist, had on Swedish penal reform.

HERMANN MANNHEIM.

THE INDISCRETIONS OF A MAGISTRATE. By Basil L. Q. Henriques. (London: George G. Harrap. 1950. Pp. 192. Price 8*s.* 6*d.* net.)

This is without question one of the more effective popular expositions of the functions of magistracy. It can be read with profit not only by those unfamiliar with the ways and means of Juvenile Courts but by all workers in the field of delinquency up to and including that latest and none too popular importation

and portent—the criminological psychiatrist. Indeed, when the time comes—and the sooner it comes the better—for newly-appointed magistrates to be seconded for compulsory training in their craft, this might well serve as a Handbook for Justices of the Peace. Clearly and vigorously written, and not unseasoned with humour, it covers adequately almost every aspect of the subject: court procedure, types of delinquency, the more familiar causal factors and the varieties of disposal of convicted offenders. The author has not shirked the task of assessing the defects as well as the virtues of the existing system, and expresses his opinions with a forthrightness, which, in view of his extensive experience, must command respect. Indeed, one of the engaging features of the book is the candour with which Mr. Henriques, seeking to portray the qualifications essential to effective magistracy, reveals his own character and temperament, including a sincere religious conviction, robust enthusiasm, ready sympathy and understanding, together with a capacity for warm indignation, a certain amount of prejudice and a naturally swift dogmatism, to the last three of which, incidentally, may be attributed some at least of the ' indiscretions ' he recalls with such affectionate pride.

Inevitably therefore many of his *obiter dicta* are not likely to pass unchallenged either by colleagues on the Bench or by other workers in the field. The author's reactions to psychiatry and the psychiatric witness, for instance, seem to call for some comment in this Journal. It is to say the least of it unfortunate that in the extremely brief section of his book dealing specifically with psychiatry in the law-court, Mr. Henriques should confine himself to recording the impression that forensic psychiatrists, with one named exception, are poor and sometimes unbalanced witnesses. To be sure at several other points he testifies to the services, both actual and potential, of the psychiatrist; but on the whole one is left with the feeling either that the author has not yet grasped the function of the psychiatrist in relation to pathological delinquency, or that he senses and resents some fundamental incompatibility of approach as between the magistrate and the psychiatrist.

This is borne out by the fact that in the second half of his book Mr. Henriques himself dons the mantle of the social psychiatrist and gives a résumé of his predilections regarding what he deliberately chooses to call ' diagnosis ' and ' treatment '. Like most lay workers, and not a few psychiatrists, he lays exclusive emphasis on environmental factors, including family history and current stresses, an etiological approach which, though an advance on earlier rules of thumb, is really an obstacle to progress in criminological psychiatry. His use of the term ' treatment ' is even more misleading, for by it he means, of course, methods of disposal within the understanding of the Court, in other words, immediately environmental influences directed towards character adjustment. As for the psychiatric witness, it need hardly be pointed out that the remedy for poor or unbalanced testimony lies largely in the hands of the magistrature, whose members should in every case make a point of ascertaining whether or not the psychiatrist has been specially trained in delinquency work. What is sauce for the magistrate is surely sauce for the psychiatrist. But perhaps by the time the book runs to a new edition, a consummation certainly to be desired, Mr. Henriques will have extended his investigations into the field of pathological delinquency in which the trained criminological psychiatrist exercises a legitimate advisory authority.

E. G.

BASIC SOCIAL PROBLEMS. By Walter A. Lunden. (Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Co. 1950. Pp. xii + 612. Price $7.50.)

This is *not* a text-book of sociology. 'Sociology studies the normal structure, functions, operations, processes and changes in Society. Social Problems study the deviations from normal, the pathologies and abnormalities in society.' This book makes no pretence at covering all the social problems but singles out basic problems confronting contemporary society: those arising out of the distribution, composition and mobility of population; the social aspects of physical and mental deficiency and diseases; the problems of poverty, of economic crises and disturbances, of family life and divorce and, finally, of juvenile delinquency and adult crime.

In this context one might expect a rather superficial treatment of criminological evidence: but this is, fortunately, far from true. The author states that most social problems are pernicious, but none penalize the present and the future as much as juvenile delinquency, and he treats this problem accordingly in terms of the total social *Gestalt* in which it exists. We are given a wealth of information, clearly and systematically presented. We learn who are delinquents, what are their individual and social characteristics, where, when and why they commit offences, what the community does about it, and how effective these measures are. Incidentally, most of the statistics refer to Iowa. The author writes with clarity and precision. His statistics are meaningful, the diagrams neat and vivid, and they never bore—which is much more than can usually be said of such devices. It may be intriguing to learn that if you are in a suicidal mood in Pennsylvania, you will probably choose Monday morning, 7 o'clock. Friday evening is the best time for murder.

T. GRYGIER.

SOVIET PSYCHIATRY. By Joseph Wortis, M.D. (Baltimore: The Williams and Wilkins Company. London: Baillière, Tindall and Cox. Pp. xvi + 314. Price 38*s.* 6*d.* net.)

This very scholarly book devotes little space to delinquency in Soviet Russia. This is not due to any neglect on the part of the Soviet scientists—a statement that a Court sentence should 'mobilize the masses to destroy the survivals of capitalism in the consciousness of man' is quoted as an illustration of the fact that psychological and social considerations are given proper weight—but the writer assumes that delinquency 'is not an important or prominent problem in the U.S.S.R. today'. The same applies to neuroses: 'The incidence of neuroses is low because they have an ample supply of its specific antidote, i.e. high morale.' The problems of juvenile delinquency and prostitution are said to have been more serious during the Civil War, and to have been dealt with very successfully by special 'communes', giving 'full opportunities for education, play and work'. The members of the 'communes' were said to be under no guards, and to preserve four rules: 'never to steal, never to drink, to work, and to obey strictly the rules adopted by the members themselves'. What happened to these experiments we are not told, and the reader may wonder: if the operation was so successful, and the patient so healthy, why is he dead?

Adult psychotherapy is mainly limited to work: 'It is this deep confidence in the restorative functions of work which has contributed to some misinformed

discussion of " forced labour camps " in unfriendly circles.' Professor Wortis seems to endorse the Soviet approach. He scorns ' our scientific reactionaries ' (by whom he evidently means psycho-analysts), prefers ' progressive ', i.e. anti-psycho-analytic currents in American neuro-psychiatry, and best of all social security on Soviet lines to solve psychiatric problems with which ' an army of psychoanalytic forces ' could not cope, ' even assuming that the psychoanalytic theory worked '.

Incidentally, we learn with pleasure that at least some of the anti-Lysenko scientists (see article by the present reviewer in this number of *The British Journal of Delinquency*) are still alive and working. This proves, according to Professor Wortis, that ' dissident opinion is tolerated in the Soviet Union, just as it is here '.

T. GRYGIER.

THE CHALLENGE OF DELINQUENCY. By Negley K. Teeters and John Otto Reinemann. (New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1950. Pp. 819. Price $7.35.)

The Professor of Sociology at Temple University and the Director of Probation for the Municipal Court of Philadelphia have written a very careful and detailed study of Juvenile Delinquency and the challenge which it presents to the community. They make no claim to have included any large proportion of comparative material, and their treatment of the problem is based mainly on American experience. Students of delinquency in Great Britain may not unreasonably have hoped for a book more closely related to the problems which are the special concern of this country. The value of a text-book of this kind, primarily designed for an American audience, is of necessity limited outside the United States.

However that may be, the authors have succeeded admirably in what is no easy task. To review the whole field of causation, treatment, and prevention in a single volume calls for special gifts of conciseness and arrangement. Nor is the territory an unexplored one. Several works designed on similar lines have been published in America in recent years. The best of them have set a high standard, and the inclusion of fresh evidence inevitably depends on the progress of contemporary delinquency research.

It is in the second and third parts of the book in which control and treatment and community responsibility are discussed that the most original contribution is made. It is disappointing that the sections dealing with Borstal and the Approved Schools are so slender. The authors appear to have relied for their material on inadequate sources, and they present a picture which is in some ways rather misleading. With the exception of these sections, however, the book is well documented. The third part, dealing with community responsibility, will repay careful study by all those members of delinquency committees operating throughout England and Wales. Social action, if it is to be successful, must operate on a broad front, and the American experience which is so accurately studied in the concluding chapters of this book is of particular value.

JOHN SPENCER.

DELINQUENCY CONTROL. By Lowell J. Carr. Revised Edition. (Harper and Bros. 1951. Pp. 581. Price $4.50.)

This treatise has gone into three editions since 1940 and its sales testify to the

interest aroused in America in the social problem which it analyses from many angles. Its continued popularity has, of course, as the author states, been due to the fact that World War II has dramatized juvenile delinquency to many Americans.

The book opens with a trenchant if rather journalistic attack on the perpetuation of myth-mindedness in a machine world where problems of nature arouse the scientific interest of the best minds. Human issues receive not only niggardly support but are disposed of by irrational explanations. Is science, however, ready for attacking problems such as delinquency? A problem must reach a certain stage of social acceptance and development before scientific technology becomes applicable, and agreement as to objectives must be reached before such techniques are usefully applied. The author's thesis is that haphazard approaches must now be abandoned and science, technology, social action and social organization, must be banded together with the full approach of authority. The chapters that follow are concerned with the trends, cycles, and expenditures of delinquency in time and most valuable charts are reproduced bearing on these trends together with illuminating charts showing the demographic or ecological distribution. But it is clearly realized that without a careful scrutiny of the 'sources of supply' of delinquents and the definitions which detecting agencies use in rounding up the young offenders there is a danger that delinquent frequency is only measured in terms of Juvenile Court turnover. It is clearly shown that up to date most of the budget goes in custodial care and actually during a period of falling prices the increased investment in child care and correction only rose 2 per cent.!

Of the effects of war on delinquency rates, Professor Carr shows that the same causal factor was registered in the U.S.A. as in Britain, namely, that despite social insecurity, the child secure in its parent's love and care rarely fell victim to anti-social conduct. The deviant pressures of the community on the child are manifold and, in fact, where they can be detected they give us power of prediction, but one of the subtlest of social causes is that of variations in cultural milieu and acceptance as is shown in the immigrant group. The individual delinquent is not neglected in what appears to be largely a socio-statistical study, as the better part of 100 pages is devoted to the problem child himself. The argument here is familiar and adds little to what we already know and the psychopathology is extremely sketchy. The rest of the volume is concerned with Social Action: leadership, leisure and communal consciousness of the problem and readiness to act in scientifically orientated philanthropy. What he tells us is a testimony to the increased awareness, increased personnel and increased action in the U.S.A.

This book is definitely a contribution to guiding textbooks for social workers and others. But although it tells the psychiatrist little more about his own job and obligations, it should act as a corrective to those who forget the social factors involved.

It is, however, particularly in its early chapters, painfully verbose, and its platform manner is likely to be acceptable more to American than to British readers. There is nevertheless much to be learnt from it and the bibliographies attached to many chapters are invaluable.

E. M.

PSYCHIATRIC EXAMINATION OF SCHOOL CHILDREN. By Muriel Barton Hall, M.D. (London: Edward Arnold and Co. 1947. Pp. 368. Price 15*s.*)

This handbook is the result of wide experience of a large variety of problem children of school age. It is designed to show how children are examined at a clinic when a psychiatric opinion is needed by schools, social agencies and the Courts.

Dr. Hall opens with a history of the Child Guidance movement and the types of disorder that are now recognized as in need of more than a pediatric inspection. As the reader's attention passes from chapter to chapter he will see that it is more than a handbook for examining techniques. It actually covers all the basic issues of Child Psychiatry, namely, complaints, history taking, physical examination, classification, the routine testing for intelligence and personality deviations, and the outstanding congenital disabilities. There is also a systematic account of the most frequently occurring disorders.

While the main psychopathic structures are mentioned, the psycho-pathology is likely to be misleading because of over-simplification and students would be wise to consult a bigger treatise or the special journals.

The volume is well written and for its compass very comprehensive. Beginners in Child Psychiatry, both medical and social workers, will find it a useful foundation on which to build.

E. M.

FATHER FLANAGAN AND BOY TOWN. By Fulton Oursler and Will Oursler. (The World's Work Press Ltd. 1950. Price 12*s.* 6*d.*)

From time to time and probably more frequently than we know, men and women arise who have the gift of understanding the needs of young persons in psychological stress, delinquent or merely abandoned or undirected by their parents. They may be doctors, social workers, priests. But each is animated not so much by scientific curiosity as by understanding and compassion nicely balanced. Such a one was Father Flanagan, founder of Boys' Town, whose life for over forty years was devoted, despite obstacles and cynicism, to the reclamation of homeless boys, unloved and unwanted—the very seed-ground of antisocial conduct. Like all true philanthropists, he knew people only for what they were, what they suffered and for what they aspired and failed. With directness and simplicity the author gives an account of his life work in Germany, Austria, and here again in the U.S.A. As time went on people clamoured to get lads under his influence and care.

While the book has no direct scientific value, no psychiatrist can afford to ignore the type of man, or the type of work. Later it would be worthy of some research, to discover in what this extraordinary gift lies. Psychoanalysis has thrown some light on the nature and part-origin at least of the moral impulse as it expresses itself in relation to others. His dictum that ' he never knew a bad boy ' is in agreement with the ethical neutrality of the students of the psychopathology of delinquency. This warm-hearted study can be commended.

E. M.

ABSTRACTS

(Under the direction of W. R. Bett (London) with the co-operation of John C. Spencer (London).)

C. H. Rolph: 'Dull Delinquents', *Further Education*, December, 1950–February, 1951, **4**, No. 3, 240–245.

The educational status of boys and girls in Approved Schools, Remand Homes, and Borstals, is discussed. Public opinion appears to be unaware of the responsibility of lack of education for juvenile crime. The best remand homes provide an opportunity for the diagnosis of the educationally subnormal child. The establishment of a 'Social Science Research Council' which would (among other things) systematically collect data about juvenile delinquency from all possible sources on a national and co-ordinated scale is recommended.

Barbara Gray: 'The Social Effects of the Film', *The Sociological Review*, 1950, **42**, Sect. 7, 135–144.

Research has been undertaken to test by statistical investigations some of the more important criticisms against the Film. Some of the results do not altogether uphold popular prejudices about its influence. Though the evil effects are often exaggerated the data on the credit side is less reassuring. The adolescents' criteria as to their selection of films is unsatisfactory. Far more disquieting evidence is drawn from an analysis of the classification of the content of films. More rigorous enforcement of the regulations concerning 'A' certificate films, as well as the setting up of a Government Department with trained advisors who could undertake the responsibility of producing films for children, are suggested.

Donald R. Cressey: 'The Criminal Violation of Financial Trust', *American Sociological Review*, (December) 1950, **15**, No. 6, 738–743.

Theories of causation in this field have been for the most part ignored by sociologists. A scientific explanation of trust violation is attempted. Interview material was collected from offenders in the Illinois State Penitentiaries at Joliet. The hypothesis, suggested by Sutherland's writings on white collar crimes, that positions of financial trust are violated when the incumbent has learned that some forms of trust violations are merely 'technical' and not 'wrong', was rejected. The final hypothesis proved superior. Trusted persons become trust violators when they conceive of themselves as having a financial problem which is non-sharable, and know that this problem can be secretly resolved by violation of the position of financial trust. They see themselves not as trust violators but as special kinds of borrowers or business men.

William W. Wattenberg and James J. Balistrieri: 'Gang Membership and Juvenile Misconduct', *American Sociological Review*, (December) 1950, **15**, No. 6, 744–752.

The hypothesis was suggested that the combination of a home typified by weak discipline and a surrounding neighbourhood having a high delinquency rate was a primary causative influence in making good adjustment in delinquent

gangs. The theory was tested from the records of 5,878 boys aged between ten and sixteen who were ' interviewed on complaint ' by Detroit police in 1946 and 1947. The boys were divided into two groups, gang members and non-gang members. The authors concluded that the former group differed from the latter in showing evidence of coming from easy-going homes and living in socio-economically low neighbourhoods. The latter displayed indications of coming from tense or depriving families.

J. C. SPENCER.

C. C. HAWKE: ' Castration and Sex Crimes.' *Journal of the Kansas Medical Society*, (October) 1950, **51,** 470–3. (Three case-reports; summary and conclusions.)

The sex criminal usually ceases to act anti-socially after castration, and he is psychologically stabilized. There is no mental deterioration, and the presence of a moderate degree of inferiority complex is balanced by the social improvement.

F. H. GEORGE: ' Psychology and Semantics.' *Rationalist Annual for the Year* 1951. London: Watts & Co., pp. 73–8.

In psychology to-day there is no general theory of behaviour. Reference is made to the work of C. L. Hull of Yale and of L. L. Whyte.

R. M. PATTERSON: ' Psychiatric Treatment of Institutionalized Delinquent Adolescent Girls.' *Diseases of the Nervous System*, (August) 1950, **11,** 227–32.

On the strength of investigations carried out at the Girls' Training School, Adrian, Michigan—a State Institution operated on the Cottage Plan, it is concluded that group therapy, conducted by an able individual, is valuable in a school for delinquent adolescent girls. Drama therapy also improves adjustment of the less verbal girls. Neither, however, is a substitute for individualized treatment.

A. P. JOHNSON *et al.*: ' The Goodenough Test as an Aid to Interpretation of Children's School Behaviour.' *American Journal of Mental Deficiency*, (April) 1950, **54,** 516–20.

Further study is needed of the projective technique with abnormal children, comparing the individual against himself rather than against others in his group.

P. GREENACRE: ' The Prepuberty Trauma in Girls.' *Psychoanalytic Quarterly*, 1950, **19,** 298–317. (Summary; 3 references.)

In the prepuberty period fateful traumata may appear as part of the presenting picture of the neuroses when the patients come for treatment. Induced by the child, these are compulsive repetitions of pre-œdipal conflicts influencing the intensity of the œdipal phase and subsequent severity and deformation of the superego. The highly defensive value of these traumata is illustrated.

R. SOBEL: 'Treatment of Character-conditioned Hostility in Adolescents.' *Nervous Child*, 1949, **8**[3], 301–10. (Summary.)

To establish a workable therapeutic relationship in the treatment of hostile adolescents it is necessary to work through the negative transference as soon as possible. Interpretation of behaviour rather than content should be utilized, together with mimicry of behaviour and mechanical devices for reproduction of vocal behaviour. This method is applicable where character-conditioned hostility is the predominant feature of the personality. It must be regarded as an adjunct to treatment and not as a substitute for working through the difficulties in living which they bring to the surface.

H. MILLER and D. W. BARUCH: 'A Study of Hostility in Allergic Children.' *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, (July) 1950, **20**, 506–19. (Table; figure; summary; 9 references.)

Manifestations of hostility in a group of children with clinical symptoms of allergy are compared with those in a control group. The most striking difference was the high incidence of blocking of outgoing hostility in the allergic group.

B. A. CRUVANT *et al.*: 'An Institutional Program for Committed Sex Deviants.' *American Journal of Psychiatry*, (September) 1950, **107**, 190–4. (Four case-reports; conclusions; 16 references.)

The majority of cases treated were exhibitionists. In the authors' experience the exhibitionist is a poor risk for intensive treatment, and he cannot be certified 'recovered', as required by the law.

F. P. GATLING: 'Frustration Reactions of Delinquents using Rosenzweig's Classification System.' *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, (October) 1950, **45**, 749–52. (Three tables; 4 references.)

S. Rosenzweig has developed a system for the classification of subjective ('Ego-defensive') reactions under 'special conditions of ego-threat' arising from frustrations. The author tried to find out if subjective reactions to frustrations in a group of delinquents would fall into Rosenzweig's classification. His results indicate simply that different groups may have, as a group, differing reactions to frustration and that, in spite of the uncertainty of the accompanying emotions, Rosenzweig's system is practical.

M. M. NICHOLSON: 'Juvenile Delinquency', *Journal of the American Medical Association*, (December 30) 1950, **144**, 1538–40.

The juvenile delinquent has gone astray as the result of insufficient guidance and care. He is not depraved—merely deprived. The health history does not influence delinquency.

D. H. STOTT: 'Delinquency and Emotional Health', *Health Education Journal*, (January) 1951, **9**, 19–23.

Delinquency is recognized as one of the symptoms of unhappiness, so that our aim should be to raise the general level of human understanding within the

family life and of the accompanying personality-health rather than to deal with delinquency as an isolated deviation.

R. Sessions Hodge: 'Medico-legal Aspects of the Treatment of the Sexual Offender, with discussion of a method of treatment by gland extracts', *Medico-Legal Journal*, 1950, **18**[4], 130–44. (Discussion; 14 references.)

Œstrone therapy is a means of modifying or abolishing libido, which is not castration and which can be modified and controlled. No case has been treated by the author except at his own request in writing. W. R. B.

OTHER REFERENCES

B. Watson: 'The Deprived Child', *Medical Press*, (January 17) 1951, **225,** 56–9.

L. Jackson: 'Emotional Attitudes Towards the Family of Normal, Neurotic and Delinquent Children—I', *British Journal of Psychology* [*General Section*], (September) 1950, **41,** 35–51. (Four tables; 6 figures; summary and conclusions; 9 references.)

Heuyer *et al.*: 'Résultats d'une topectomie chez un délinquant vingt fois récidiviste', *Annales Médico-Psychologiques*, (January) 1951, **109** ann., t. **i,** 65–8. (Case-report; discussion.)

J. W. Scott and F. V. Smith: 'A Handlist of Psychology Periodicals in the Learned Libraries of Great Britain', *Journal of Documentation*, (September) 1950, **6,** 152–66.

G. McDermaid and E. G. Winkler: 'Psychiatric Study of Homicide Cases', *Journal of Clinical Psychopathology*, (July) 1950, **11,** 93–146. (Twenty-seven case-reports; summary and conclusion; 36 references.)

G. Bini: 'Il problema sessuale nelle carceri.' *Athena*, *Roma*, (June) 1950, **16,** 119–20.

H. Stern: 'Deux ans de dépistage psychiatrique appliqué aux détenus de Saint-Michel', *Toulouse Médical*, (July) 1950, **51,** 429–36.

J. Laboucarie *et al.*: 'Les facteurs de la délinquance juvénile dans la région de Toulouse', *Toulouse Médical*, (June) 1950, **51,** 303–24.

'De medische behandeling van patiënten in de voormalige Nederlandse tuchthuizen', *Nederlandsch Tijdschrift voor Geneeskunde*, (December 9) 1950, **94,** IV, 3560–4.

Otto Pollak: 'The Criminality of Women.' (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. 1950. Pp. xxi + 180. Price $3.50.) (See *Psychological Abstracts*, (November) 1950, **24,** 671, Abstract 5964.)

N. Polansky *et al.*: 'An Investigation of Behavioral Contagion in Groups', *Human Relations*, 1950, **3,** 319–48. (Twelve tables; summary of findings and clinical implications; 22 footnotes.)

M. G. Stringaris: 'Asoziale und verbrecherische Schizophrene in Griechenland', *Nervenarzt*, (November 20) 1950, **21,** 487–9. (Five case-reports.)

F. Oursler: 'What Makes a Juvenile Delinquent?', *Reader's Digest*, (December) 1950, **57,** 81–6. A 'preview' of 'Unravelling the Threads of Juvenile Delinquency.' By Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck. (New York: The Commonwealth Fund. 1950.)

P. M. Kinsie: 'Sex Crimes and the Prostitution Racket', *Journal of Social Hygiene*, (June) 1950, **36,** 249–52.

N. BLACKMAN: ' The Genesis of Homosexuality ', *Journal of the Missouri State Medical Association*, (November) 1950, **47**, 814–7. (Four case-reports: summary.)

J. G. N. CUSHING: ' Psychopathology of Sexual Delinquency ', *Journal of Clinical Psychopathology*, (April) 1950, **11**, 49–56. (Eleven references.)

S. S. RICHARDS and F. P. SIMSARIAN: ' A Report from a School for Emotionally Disturbed Children ', *Mental Hygiene*, (October) 1950, **34**, 611–9.

L. BOVET: ' Les aspects psychiatriques de la délinquance juvénile ', *Bulletin of the World Health Organization*, 1950, **3**[1], 63–162. (Summary and general conclusions in English; 137 references.)

HENRI BARUK and MAURICE BACHET: ' Le test Tsedek, le jugement moral et la délinquance.' (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France. 1950. Pp. 90.)

J. SOLÉ SAGARRA: ' Kretschmer y la psiquiatría española ', *Clínica y Laboratorio*, (November) 1950, **50**, 375–81. (Conclusions; 39 references.)

M. BACHET: ' Le problème des encéphaloses criminogènes apres le récent congrès de criminologie ', *Annales Médico-Psychologiques*, (November) 1950, **108** ann., t. **2**, 518–22. (Discussion.)

L. DÉROBERT: ' L'évolution du suicide en France en 1947, 1948 et 1949 ', *Bulletin de l'Institut National d'Hygiène*, (October–December) 1950, **5**, 643–50. (Three figures; 8 tables.)

L. DÉROBERT: ' Essai de statistique criminelle ', *Bulletin de l'Institut National d'Hygiène*, (October–December) 1950, **5**, 651–86. (Fifteen tables; 26 figures.)

W. J. T. KIMBER: ' The Value of Psychological Examination of School Children ', *Medical Press*, (December 6) 1950, **224**, 553–6. (Conclusion.)

M. MÜLLER: ' Die Bedeutung der Massnahmen des schweizerischen Strafgesetzes für den Psychiater ', *Nervenarzt*, (November 20) 1950, **21**, 483–6.

K. SCHNEIDER: ' Selbstmord und Dienstbeschädigung—Schizophrenie und Dienstbeschädigung. Drei Gutachten ', *Nervenarzt*, (November 20) 1950, **21**, 480–3.

A. TORRIE: ' Youngsters Who Go Wrong ', *Health Horizon*, (Winter) 1951, 39–44.

J. PACZOWSKY: ' Einige Probleme und Erfahrungen bei der Behandlung tuberkulöser Strafgefangener ', *Zeitschrift für Tuberkulose*, 1950, **95**[3–4], 166–70. (Summary; 7 references.)

C.-N. CLEMENTE and C. GIANNETTO: ' Personalità amorale e criminalità abituale.' *Rassegna di Neuropsichiatria*, (July-August) 1950, **4**, 415–22. (Three references.)

C.-N. CLEMENTE and C. GIANNETTO: ' Contributo elettroencefalografico allo studio delle personalità impulsive.' *Rassegna di Neuropsichiatria*, (July-August) 1950, **4**, 423–8. (Seven case-reports.)

W. A. SCHONFELD: ' Inadequate Masculine Physique as a Factor in Personality Development of Adolescent Boys.' *Psychosomatic Medicine*, (January-February) 1950, **12**, 49–54. (Summary; 33 references.)

G. A. FOULDS: ' Characteristic Projection Test Responses of a Group of Defective Delinquents.' *British Journal of Psychology (General Section)*, (March) 1950, **40**, 124–7. (Conclusions; appendix; 2 references.)

A. KENNEDY: ' Psychiatry and Criminal Responsibility.' *University of Durham Medical Gazette*, (March) 1950, **3**, 18–9.

J. PACZOWSKY: 'Zur Frage der Haftfähigkeit krimineller Tuberkulöser.' *Tuberkulosearzt*, (April) 1950, **4**, 220–1. (Two references.)

'Contribución de la Psiquiatría a la profilaxis social del delito.' By Manuel Pérez de Petinto y Bartoméu. Madrid: Asociación Española de Neuropsiquiatría. Not for sale. A report read at the Legal Psychiatry Congress in Valencia, May-June, 1950.

E. WELLISCH: 'The Value of Personality Tests in Child Guidance.' *Medical Press*, (October 4) 1950, **224**, 331–6. (Summary; 12 references.)

'Judicial Welfare Services and Institutions. No. 3—Juvenile Courts.' *Journal of the Royal Institute of Public Health and Hygiene*, (September) 1950, **13**, 317–27.

NOTES

MALADJUSTED CHILDREN

Readers of this Journal will be interested in the Residential Schools for Maladjusted Pupils which are being set up under the Education Act of 1944. The Act and its Regulations avoid any clear definition of the term 'maladjusted', but so far as they touch the younger age groups these Schools will obviously be dealing with children who are, so to speak, just 'deciding' whether their conflicts are to be expressed in neurotic symptoms or delinquent behaviour. Such a School is *Bodenham Manor, near Hereford*, which was opened a year ago by the Birmingham Society for the Care of Invalid and Nervous Children.

The Managers say: 'The security which the child needs in order to achieve stability is better provided by the experience of being loved than by subjection to an outward authority, though the need for a secure and orderly régime is not to be disregarded.' 'The experience of being loved' it is, of course, the primary duty of the staff to provide, though the 'secure and orderly régime' is ensured in part by the adults and in part by a system of shared responsibility adapted to the needs of children of the age group, on admission, of eight to eleven.

Such children present serious educational problems, and most of them are found to be retarded, but the fundamental problem is not an educational one in the narrow sense. The children need a substitute home with surrogate parents who will attempt to provide the elements that have been lacking in the unsatisfactory homes from which so many of them come.

It follows from this that the persons in charge need Mental Health, rather than pedagogical, training and experience, and the Managers of Bodenham Manor have therefore appointed Mr. and Mrs. David Wills as Warden and House Mother respectively. They enjoy the advice of Dr. C. L. C. Burns, Birmingham, as Visiting Psychiatrist.

For this reason, too, Bodenham Manor is open throughout the year, though the children, of course, go to school during the usual school terms, and they might in suitable circumstances go home for about a week during the holidays.

It is felt that while such an institution must be small enough to allow of the maintenance of a family atmosphere it must be large enough to make communal activities possible, and to provide scope for a measure of self-government which

has been found to have a great educational value. The complement, therefore, has been fixed at fifteen boys and fifteen girls, and the length of stay will, of course, depend upon the progress made by the individual child.

Admissions are not restricted to any IQ group, the aim being to have a community with an intelligence range approximately the same as that of an ordinary primary school. At the same time the aim of the school is a therapeutic one, and no child is admitted whose maladjustment appears to be due to defective intelligence, or to any other cause which cannot be expected to yield to environmental treatment.

The teaching side is the sole responsibility of the Head Teacher and the atmosphere and régime of the classrooms are in close accord with those of home. This fusion is further helped out by the teaching staff sharing in the general life of the home, and the home staff concerning themselves, so far as their primary duties allow, in the children's education in the narrower as well as in the wider sense.

With a view to keeping close touch with the children's families, with whom in most cases a great deal of work needs to be done, preference is given to children whose homes are within easy reach of Birmingham.

(Information supplied by the Warden, Mr. W. David Wills, author of ' The Hawkspur Experiment ' and ' The Barns Experiment.')

Report of the Commissioners of Prisons for the Year 1949

(*H.M. Stationery Office, Cmd.* 8088, 1950, 173 *pp.*, 4*s.*)

This Report is in many ways a remarkable document which should be studied by penologists everywhere. It is considerably longer than most of its predecessors, mainly on account of the inclusion of an extremely valuable Appendix of more than thirty pages on the psychological treatment of selected prisoners at Wormwood Scrubs and of a shorter ' Report on Neglectful Mothers ' at Holloway. Moreover, it is worthy of special attention because it shows how deeply the English prison system has been affected, already at this early stage, by the Criminal Justice Act, 1948, and the Prison Rules of 1949. While the statistical figures in the Report relate, on the whole, to the year 1948 and cannot, therefore, throw much light on the effect of the new legislation, the full narrative given by the Commissioners supplies a much more topical account of the present position and of future problems. Of particular interest are, naturally, their observations on the impact of those sections of the Act which require the provision of new forms of detention such as Corrective Training Prisons and Detention Centres or have at least substantially changed the character of already existing institutions such as Preventive Detention. While Detention Centres for young people are still in their preparatory stage (plans for the opening of a few ' pilot ' Centres are under consideration), there has been a steady stream of prisoners sentenced to Preventive Detention and, in particular, a rapid influx of Corrective Trainees which has heavily taxed the ability of the Commissioners to improvise. The resulting problems of administration and also of closer co-ordination between Courts and Commissioners have been widely discussed, and there is no space here for any detailed comment. One cannot but sympathize, however, with the following remark: ' In a situation where all the prisons were already full and overfull,

with no knowledge of the extent to which the Courts would use this new power, or of the types of offender on which the sentence was likely to be passed, it was not easy to devise preliminary arrangements which would be ready for any situation which might be disclosed ' (p. 31). The purpose of Corrective Training is, in the view of the Commissioners, ' not to provide some new form of training, but to give the Courts power to pass sentences long enough to enable the methods of training already developed in training prisons to be effectively applied '. The conclusion to be drawn from this is, of course, that only offenders likely to benefit from the régime in the training prisons should be given such sentences, and the hope may be expressed that the next Report may provide fuller information on the type of offender received and on the operation of the new Allocation Centre at Reading. Concerning Preventive Detention, it is encouraging to find that the Commissioners, more progressive than the letter of the law, regard it as their duty, ' even towards recidivist offenders of this type, to do whatever may be possible to send them out of prison willing and able to lead an honest life ', in other words to devise for them a positive and constructive, instead of, as under the previous Act, a largely negative régime (p. 26). It is an interesting reflection that, to provide such a régime, the new Prison Rules and the administration had to substitute for the ' double-track ' system of the Act of 1908 and for the ' single-track ' system of the present Act a three-tier system under which the Prevention Detention prisoner may pass through three different types of establishments in the course of his sentence.

Although it is much too early to judge the effect of the changes made by the new Act in the organization of After-Care, the information given in the Report provides already some food for thought. It is estimated, for example, that the numbers of prisoners discharged under section 22 with the obligation to report changes of address will have reached 750 in 1950, and the Central After-Care Association drily comments that it ' is not authorized in such cases to provide material assistance or exercise its usual form of after-care. Its duty is limited to registering addresses and obtaining monthly notifications and making a periodic check. The clerical work involved, however, is considerable ' (p. 51). One wonders whether the form of after-care provided under the Act for persons discharged from ordinary prisons after serving substantial sentences, even if it is supplemented by the efforts of their local Aid Societies, will in the long run prove to be adequate. It is noted in the Report that of men discharged after sentences of Penal Servitude or Preventive Detention and now no longer under licence a fairly high proportion failed to co-operate with the Association because they realized that they were entirely free under the new law.

HERMANN MANNHEIM.

We are glad to note that in recent months local Reports from Probation Committees, Prison Departments and organizations of various kinds have reached us in increasing numbers from this country and from abroad. Lack of space does not allow any reference to these in the present number. It is hoped, however, to publish brief comments on selected reports in later issues, and we are grateful to all those who are willing to supply us with such material.

British Sociological Association

A national association, to be known as the British Sociological Association, was launched on February 3 last by general agreement at a widely representative meeting held at the London School of Economics.

Details of the Association's aims and activities, conditions of membership and the services it is hoped to offer, may be obtained on application to:

The Hon. General Secretary,
British Sociological Association,
c/o Skepper House,
31, John Adam Street,
London, W.C.2.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editorial Board

Sirs,—You state that the ' concept of partial responsibility ' is psychiatrically untenable and logically meaningless, but is it ? Without some such concept one would appear to be driven into the position of viewing morbid compulsion and insanity as identical equivalents. May it not be that, accepting the concept of partial responsibility, punishment may still be proper if it is regarded as an inevitable consequence of certain behaviour, rather than reformative as it might be were there full responsibility?

Furthermore, is it correct to assume that punishment of any kind is necessarily without effect on the ' psychopathic moiety ' of the personality? Possibly the dilemma of law *versus* psychiatry is insoluble, but the concept of partial responsibility does not in the writer's experience make it more so (if indeed the concept of variable insolubility is itself logically tenable).

Yours, etc.,

Alan Maberly.

Reply to Dr. Maberly

Dr. Maberly's misgivings about the abandoning of the concept of partial responsibility are not to be easily put aside, but this conception is born not only of the rigidity of the legal need, but also of our own not too clear definitions in psychiatry.

Psychiatry is not primarily concerned, as a scientific discipline, with responsibility but with mental states of varying degrees of intensity, and varying degrees to which the disorder invades the personality.

Sometimes the invasion has no appreciable effect on the subject's social attitudes, as in depression, which can, however, permeate at least for a time the whole personality. The psychopath does all too frequently show a lowered social capacity in action, and always, perhaps, in his thoughts and amoral make-up.

The alcoholic may at a time of intoxication commit his crime, and so may the drug addict and the episodic epileptic character with or without cerebral dysrhythmia. In

none of these cases can we say which part of the personality was sufficiently intact to leave the patient free to make moral judgements, and therefore be viewed as a punishable person.

According to Italian usage, for example, Section 89 of the Italian Penal Code states ' if at the moment of committing the act he was in such and such a mental state '. If we are to punish the man for his rational self at other times are we punishing his crime, and if we consider his momentary criminal act during mental disorder, can we treat this alone as a non-culpable offence?

If we are to hope for the inclusion of psychiatric opinion in a final legal decision, it is not to admit partial responsibility, but to admit that mental states do sometimes cause crimes where clinical history exposes facts and processes to bear them out.

It is for the present at least entirely left to the judges to protect society by segregation and to suggest treatment if the judges think fit. The question of degrees of responsibility would then not arise. At least society at some future epoch of enlightenment will be amply safeguarded, and during segregation treatment can be instituted. This would leave a judicial arm to treat crime penally in the absence of clinical evidence of abnormality. For the time being the judges must decide on the grounds of penology. It is left to the psychiatrist to train himself in the art of reporting to the justices. If he presents the latter with a clinical history which carries conviction, the judge can decide not on partial responsibility, but on the amount and quantity of the treatment the offender is to receive. It may well be that even at this stage the justices might seek advice from the psychiatrist as to the efficacy of punishment in a particular case.

E. M.

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS NUMBER

GEORGE BENSON, Member of Parliament for Chesterfield, is Chairman of the Howard League for Penal Reform and a member of the Home Office Advisory Council on the Treatment of Offenders. Author of ' Flogging: the Law and Practice in England ' (1937).

T. GRYGIER, Ph.D., is Research Fellow of the I.S.T.D. He was trained in law, political science and psychology in Poland and spent several years in Soviet Russia during the last war. Author of ' Displaced Persons: a Study in Social and Criminal Psychology ' (Ph.D. thesis, London, 1950, not yet published).

W. F. ROPER, M.B., B.S., was a contributor to the first number of this Journal. (See Vol. I, No. 1, p. 76.)

THE BRITISH JOURNAL OF PSYCHOLOGY

(General Section)

Edited by D. W. HARDING

Vol. XLII. Parts 1 & 2. *March and May 1951.* *25s. net.*

LEO POSTMAN, J. S. BRUNER and R. D. WALK. The Perception of Error.
EDGAR HOWARTH. The Role of Depth of Focus in Depth Perception.
K. R. L. HALL. The Fitness of Signs for Words.
H. KAY and E. C. POULTON. Anticipation in Memorising.
T. M. HIGHAM. The Experimental Study of the Transmission of Rumour.
A. KALDEGG. A Study of German and English Teacher Training Students by Means of Projective Techniques.
H. J. EYSENCK. Primary Social Attitudes and the 'Social Insight' Test.
F. W. WARBURTON. The Ability of the Gurkha Recruit.
G. ELOFF. Orientations in the Mole-Rat Cryptomys.
R. A. ALBINO and H. LONG. The Effect of Infant Food-Deprivation upon Adult Hoarding in the White Rat.
NORAH E. GRAHAM, I. G. BAXTER and R. C. BROWNE. Manual Tracking in Response to the Display of Horizontal, Vertical and Circular Scales.
R. L. BEURLE. Electronic Aids for Blind People.
NORRIE WARD. Comparison of Performances in Road Cycling Time Trials by Individuals of Different Capacity.
A. DEANS PEGGS. Note on a 'New' Non-Verbal Intelligence Test Item.
CRITICAL NOTICES and PUBLICATIONS RECENTLY RECEIVED.

The subscription price per volume, payable in advance, is 40s. net (post free).

Subscriptions may be sent to any bookseller or to the

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

BENTLEY HOUSE, EUSTON ROAD, LONDON, N.W.1

THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF PSYCHO-ANALYSIS

Editor: W. HOFFER

Assistant Editors: JOHN RICKMAN · W. CLIFFORD M. SCOTT · C. P. OBERNDORF

VOLUME XXII, NUMBER 2, now available, includes the following papers:–

HERBERT READ. *Psycho-Analysis and the Problem of Æsthetic Value.*
DAVID BERES. *A Dream, A Vision and A Poem.*
WALTER BROMBERG. *A Psychological Study of Murder.*
MERLIN THOMAS. *Sexual Symbolism in Industry.*
EVA M. ROSENFELD. *The Panheaded Moses – a Parallel.*
EMILIO SERVADIO. *An Unknown Statuette of Moses.*
News, Notes and Comments · Reviews · Untranslated Freud.

OBTAINABLE BY SUBSCRIPTION ONLY: 40S. PER VOLUME OF FOUR PARTS (U.S.A. $8·50)

Published for THE INSTITUTE OF PSYCHO-ANALYSIS
by BAILLIÈRE, TINDALL AND COX,
7-8 Henrietta Street, London, W.C.2.

Just Published

PERSONALITY & PSYCHOSIS

BY OTHO W. S. FITZGERALD, M.A., M.D., D.P.M.

Medical Superintendent, Shenley Hospital, Hertfordshire

IN THIS BOOK the author seeks the links between personality and psychosis. An analysis of personality traits is made following, in the main, Kretschmer's typology. The main divisions into which human personality may be classified are then examined, and inquiry is made into the types of psychosis which could develop in each of these divisions.

Case histories follow illustrating the various psychoses and demonstrating how the particular psychosis, in each case, is related to the prepsychotic personality.

PERSONALITY AND PSYCHOSIS is intended as a practical handbook for the use of doctors and ancillary professional workers in the psychiatrical field.

Pp. viii + 134. *Postage* 9*d*. 12*s*. 6*d*.

BAILLIÈRE, TINDALL & COX

7–8 Henrietta Street, London, W.C.2